arXiv:1110.3032v2 [math.CA] 13 Jul 2012

A family of Nikishin systems with periodic recurrence coefficients

Steven Delvaux*, Abey López*, Guillermo López Lagomasino†

July 16, 2012

Abstract

Suppose we have a Nikishin system of p measures with the kth generating measure of the Nikishin system supported on an interval $\Delta_k \subset \mathbb{R}$ with $\Delta_k \cap \Delta_{k+1} = \emptyset$ for all k. It is well known that the corresponding staircase sequence of multiple orthogonal polynomials satisfies a $(p+2)$-term recurrence relation whose recurrence coefficients, under appropriate assumptions on the generating measures, have periodic limits of period p. (The limit values depend only on the positions of the intervals Δ_k.) Taking these periodic limit values as the coefficients of a new $(p+2)$-term recurrence relation, we construct a canonical sequence of monic polynomials $\{P_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$, the so-called *Chebyshev-Nikishin polynomials*. We show that the polynomials P_n themselves form a sequence of multiple orthogonal polynomials with respect to some Nikishin system of measures, with the kth generating measure being absolutely continuous on Δ_k. In this way we generalize a result of the third author and Rocha [22] for the case $p = 2$. The proof uses the connection with block Toeplitz matrices, and with a certain Riemann surface of genus zero. We also obtain strong asymptotics and an exact Widom-type formula for the second kind functions of the Nikishin system for $\{P_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$.

Keywords: Multiple orthogonal polynomial, Nikishin system, block Toeplitz matrix, Hermite-Padé approximant, strong asymptotics, ratio asymptotics.

2010 AMS classification: Primary 42C05; Secondary 41A21.

1 Introduction and statement of results

1.1 Nikishin system

Let $p \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and let $\Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_p \subset \mathbb{R}$ be compact intervals such that

$$\Delta_k \cap \Delta_{k+1} = \emptyset, \qquad k = 1, \ldots, p-1.$$

Assume that for each $k \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$, σ_k is a finite positive measure supported on Δ_k with density $\sigma_k'(x) > 0$ for a.e. $x \in \Delta_k$. We denote with

$$\mathcal{M} = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_p) = \mathcal{N}(\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_p) \tag{1.1}$$

---

*Department of Mathematics, University of Leuven (KU Leuven), Celestijnenlaan 200B, B-3001 Leuven, Belgium. email: {steven.delvaux, abey.lopezgarcia}@wis.kuleuven.be.

†Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Avda. Universidad 30, 28911 Leganés, Madrid, Spain. email: lago@math.uc3m.es.

S.D. and A.L. are Postdoctoral Fellows of the Fund for Scientific Research-Flanders (FWO), Belgium. G.L.L. is partially supported by research grant MTM 2009-12740-C03-01 of Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación, Spain.

the Nikishin system generated by the measures σ_k. The construction of such a system is based on the following "product operation" for measures; given measures σ_α, σ_β, supported on disjoint compact intervals on $\mathbb{R}$, set

$$\mathrm{d}\langle\sigma_\alpha,\sigma_\beta\rangle(x) := \int \frac{\mathrm{d}\sigma_\beta(t)}{x-t}\,\mathrm{d}\sigma_\alpha(x).$$

This defines a new measure whose support coincides with that of σ_α. The system $\mathcal{M}$ in (1.1) is then defined as follows (the notation was introduced in [15]):

$$\mu_1 := \sigma_1, \quad \mu_2 := \langle\sigma_1,\sigma_2\rangle, \quad \mu_3 := \langle\sigma_1,\sigma_2,\sigma_3\rangle = \langle\sigma_1,\langle\sigma_2,\sigma_3\rangle\rangle, \quad \ldots, \quad \mu_p := \langle\sigma_1,\langle\sigma_2,\ldots,\sigma_p\rangle\rangle.$$

Thus the measures $\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_p$ are all of fixed sign and supported on Δ_1. Nikishin systems were introduced in [24]. These systems (and variations of them) have attracted an ever increasing interest during the last decades, due to their many theoretical and practical applications, see e.g., [1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25].

For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ we define the multi-index

$$\mathbf{n} := (n_1,\ldots,n_p) := (\underbrace{m+1,\ldots,m+1}_{k \text{ times}},\underbrace{m,\ldots,m}_{p-k \text{ times}}) \in \mathbb{Z}^p_{\geq 0}, \tag{1.2}$$

where $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $k \in \{0,1,\ldots,p-1\}$ are such that $n = mp + k$. Note that we have $|\mathbf{n}| := n_1 + n_2 + \cdots + n_p = n$.

Let $(Q_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ be the diagonal sequence of multiple orthogonal polynomials associated with the Nikishin system $\mathcal{M}$. That is, the polynomial Q_n is the monic polynomial of degree n that satisfies for each $k = 1,\ldots,p$ the orthogonality conditions

$$\int_{\Delta_1} Q_n(x)\,x^l\,\mathrm{d}\mu_k(x) = 0, \qquad l = 0,1,\ldots,n_k-1, \tag{1.3}$$

where n_k is the k-th component of the multi-index $\mathbf{n}$ in (1.2). The existence and uniqueness of the sequence $(Q_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ follows from the (weak) perfectness of Nikishin systems, see e.g. [25]. (See also [14] where it is shown that Nikishin systems are perfect.) It is well known that the polynomials Q_n satisfy a $(p+2)$-term recurrence relation

$$zQ_n(z) = Q_{n+1}(z) + a_{n,n}Q_n(z) + a_{n,n-1}Q_{n-1}(z) + \cdots + a_{n,n-p}\,Q_{n-p}(z), \tag{1.4}$$

with initial conditions

$$Q_{-p} \equiv Q_{-p+1} \equiv \cdots \equiv Q_{-1} \equiv 0, \quad Q_0 \equiv 1,$$

and with $a_{n,n-p} \neq 0$ for all $n \geq p$. The recurrence coefficients $a_{n,m}$ in (1.4) can be viewed as the entries of the banded Hessenberg operator

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a_{0,0} & 1 & & \\ a_{1,0} & a_{1,1} & 1 & \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ a_{p,0} & a_{p,1} & \ddots & \ddots \\ & a_{p+1,1} & a_{p+1,2} & \ddots \\ & & \ddots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}. \tag{1.5}$$

Thus A is a semi-infinite matrix with one superdiagonal, filled with 1's, and with p subdiagonals. All the other entries of A are equal to zero.

1.2 Chebyshev-Nikishin polynomials

It was proved in [5] that the following ratio asymptotic formulas hold:

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{Q_{mp+k}(z)}{Q_{mp+k-1}(z)} =: F_k(z), \qquad k = 1 \ldots, p, \tag{1.6}$$

where the limits are valid uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_1$. The limiting ratios $F_k(z)$ will be described in more detail in Section 4.

The ratio asymptotics (1.6) imply, see [2], that for each fixed (i, j), $0 \le j \le p-1$, $j \le i \le j+p$ the following limit exists:

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} a_{mp+i,mp+j} =: b_{i,j}. \tag{1.7}$$

For all $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$, we take $b_{mp+i,mp+j} := b_{i,j}$. This means that the banded Hessenberg operator A in (1.5) is a compact perturbation of the tridiagonal block Toeplitz operator

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} B_0 & B_{-1} & & & \\ B_1 & B_0 & B_{-1} & & \\ & B_1 & B_0 & B_{-1} & \\ & & B_1 & B_0 & \ddots \\ & & & \ddots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}, \tag{1.8}$$

where the blocks B_k are of size $p \times p$ and given by

$$B_0 = \begin{pmatrix} b_{0,0} & 1 & & \\ b_{1,0} & b_{1,1} & \ddots & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & 1 \\ b_{p-1,0} & b_{p-1,1} & \ldots & b_{p-1,p-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_1 = \begin{pmatrix} b_{p,0} & b_{p,1} & \ldots & b_{p,p-1} \\ & b_{p+1,1} & \ldots & b_{p+1,p-1} \\ & & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & & b_{2p-1,p-1} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{1.9}$$

$$B_{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{1.10}$$

We view the diagonals of T as infinite periodic sequences with period p.

Theorem 1.1. *The following relations hold for all k, j and all $l \in \{1, \ldots, p-1\}$:*

$$b_{k,k-1} = b_{j,j-1} =: \beta, \tag{1.11}$$

$$b_{k+1,k-l} - b_{k,k-l-1} = b_{k,k-l}(b_{k-l,k-l} - b_{k,k}). \tag{1.12}$$

Theorem 1.1 generalizes a result in [22] for the case $p = 2$. It will be proved in Section 7. However, Theorem 1.1 will not be used in the rest of the paper.

We define the *Chebyshev-Nikishin polynomials* [22] as the monic polynomials $(P_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ associated with the operator T in (1.8); that is,

$$P_n(z) = \det(zI_n - T_n), \tag{1.13}$$

where I_n denotes the identity matrix of size n, and T_n is the $n \times n$ principal submatrix of T. The polynomials P_n satisfy the recurrence relation

$$zP_n(z) = P_{n+1}(z) + b_{n,n}P_n(z) + \cdots + b_{n,n-p}P_{n-p}(z)$$

with the initial conditions

$$P_{-p} \equiv P_{-p+1} \equiv \cdots \equiv P_{-1} \equiv 0, \quad P_0 \equiv 1.$$

Note that for $p = 1$ and $\Delta_1 = [-2, 2]$, the polynomials P_n reduce to the classical Chebyshev polynomials of the second kind for this interval. This explains the name Chebyshev-Nikishin polynomials [22].

1.3 Nikishin system generated by the Chebyshev-Nikishin polynomials

It is easy to see that there exist positive measures $(\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_p)$ supported on Δ_1 so that

$$\frac{1}{F_k(z)} = \int_{\Delta_1} \frac{1}{z-t}\, \mathrm{d}\nu_k(t), \qquad k = 1, \ldots, p. \tag{1.14}$$

This is a consequence of the ratio asymptotics in (1.6) and the interlacing of the zeros of $Q_{mp+k}(z)$ and $Q_{mp+k-1}(z)$ [5]. Alternatively, the integral representation (1.14) can be obtained from the analytic properties of $\frac{1}{F_k(z)}$ using [18, Theorem A.6] (see (4.2) below) which ensures that the measures $\nu_k, k = 1, \ldots, p$, are absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

The main goal of this paper is to establish the following two theorems on the Chebyshev-Nikishin polynomials $P_n(z)$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $(\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_p)$ be the measures on Δ_1 defined in* (1.14). *Then the Chebyshev-Nikishin polynomials P_n satisfy the orthogonality conditions*

$$\int_{\Delta_1} P_n(x)\, x^l\, \mathrm{d}\nu_k(x) = 0, \qquad l = 0, \ldots, n_k - 1, \quad k = 1, \ldots, p, \tag{1.15}$$

where n_k is the k-th component of the multi-index $\mathbf{n}$ in (1.2).

Theorem 1.3. *The measures $(\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_p)$ form a Nikishin system on $(\Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_p)$. That is, there exist measures ρ_k supported on Δ_k, $k = 1, \ldots, p$, such that $(\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_p) = \mathcal{N}(\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_p)$. The measure ρ_k is absolutely continuous on Δ_k, with its density $\rho_k'(x)$ being non-vanishing and of a fixed sign (either positive or negative) on the interior of Δ_k.*

Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 will be proved in Sections 5 and 6 respectively. For $p = 2$ these theorems reduce to a result in [22]. Our proofs will be markedly different from the ones in [22]. A generalization of Theorem 1.2 to other systems of multi-indices $\mathbf{n}$ will be given in Section 9.

1.4 About the proof of Theorem 1.2: ratio asymptotics

Let

$$F(z, x) := \frac{1}{z} B_{-1} + B_0 + z B_1 - x I_p \tag{1.16}$$

be the block Toeplitz symbol associated with T in (1.8), and let

$$f(z, x) := \det F(z, x). \tag{1.17}$$

The algebraic equation $f(z, x) = 0$ has $p + 1$ roots $z_1(x), \ldots, z_{p+1}(x)$ (counting multiplicities) that we label so that

$$|z_1(x)| \le |z_2(x)| \le \cdots \le |z_{p+1}(x)|, \qquad x \in \mathbb{C}. \tag{1.18}$$

We introduce the sets

$$\Gamma_k := \{x \in \mathbb{C} : |z_k(x)| = |z_{k+1}(x)|\}, \qquad k = 1, \ldots, p. \tag{1.19}$$

In the proof of Theorem 1.2, the following result will play a pivotal role.

Proposition 1.4. *We have that*

$$\Gamma_k = \Delta_k, \qquad k = 1, \ldots, p, \tag{1.20}$$

and

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{P_{mp+k}(x)}{P_{mp+k-1}(x)} = \lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{Q_{mp+k}(x)}{Q_{mp+k-1}(x)} =: F_k(x), \qquad k = 1, \ldots, p, \tag{1.21}$$

uniformly on each compact subset of $\mathbb{C} \setminus (\Delta_1 \cup \mathcal{A})$*, with* $\mathcal{A}$ *a set of finite cardinality. Here we use the notation in* (1.6)*.*

Proposition 1.4 will be proved in Section 4. The equality (1.20) was already obtained by Aptekarev [1, Prop. 2.1–2.2] but we will provide an alternative proof.

Remark 1.5. Once we have Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 to our disposal, it will follow that the polynomials P_n are of multiple orthogonality with respect to a Nikishin system. Equation (1.21) is then a consequence of the main result in [5]. It also follows that the zeros of P_n are simple and lie in the interior of Δ_1, with the zeros of two consecutive polynomials interlacing [5, Theorem 2.1]. Therefore in (1.21) the convergence is uniform on each compact subset of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_1$.

1.5 Strong asymptotics, Widom-type formulas, and the second kind functions

As a consequence of Widom's determinant identity for block Toeplitz matrices [27, Section 6], we have the following *exact* formula for $P_{mp+k}(x)$ (see [11, Section 4])

$$P_{mp+k}(x) = \frac{(-1)^{p+k}}{f_p} \sum_{j=1}^{p+1} \frac{\det F^{[p,k+1]}(z_j(x), x)}{\prod_{i=1, i\neq j}^{p+1}(z_j(x) - z_i(x))} z_j(x)^{-m-1}, \tag{1.22}$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $k = 0, 1, \ldots, p-1$, where we write

$$f_p = \prod_{i=0}^{p-1} b_{p+i,i}, \tag{1.23}$$

and where we denote with $F^{[p,k+1]}$ the submatrix of F in (1.16) obtained by deleting row p and column $k+1$. Note that we label the rows and columns of F as $1, 2, \ldots, p$, i.e., we start counting from 1 rather than 0. In writing (1.22), we are implicitly using the fact that $f_p \neq 0$. This will be justified in Section 4, see (4.5).

Equation (1.22) holds for all x for which the roots $z_j(x)$ are pairwise distinct. If $x \in \mathbb{C}$ is such that two roots $z_j(x)$ and $z_k(x)$ with $j \neq k$ are equal (there are only finitely many such x) then (1.22) remains true provided we replace the right hand side by its limiting value.

As a consequence of (1.22) we have the strong asymptotic formula

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} P_{mp+k}(x)\, z_1(x)^{m+1} = \frac{(-1)^{p+k}}{f_p} \frac{\det F^{[p,k+1]}(z_1(x), x)}{\prod_{i=2}^{p+1}(z_1(x) - z_i(x))}, \tag{1.24}$$

for any fixed $k \in \{0, \ldots, p-1\}$, uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Gamma_1$ [11, Section 4].

In this paper we will obtain similar Widom-type formulas for the second kind functions of the Nikishin system generated by the P_n. Recall that the second kind functions $\Psi_{n,l}(z)$ are defined recursively by [15]

$$\Psi_{n,0}(z) := P_n(z) \tag{1.25}$$

and

$$\Psi_{n,l}(z) = \int_{\Delta_l} \frac{\Psi_{n,l-1}(t)}{z-t}\, \mathrm{d}\rho_l(t), \tag{1.26}$$

for $l = 1, \ldots, p$, where ρ_l is the measure supported on Δ_l described in Theorem 1.3. The statement of the Widom-type formulas for $\Psi_{n,l}(z)$ requires some extra notations and is deferred to Section 8.

1.6 Outline of the paper

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall some general results on multiple orthogonality relations for banded Hessenberg operators. In Section 3 we apply these results to the Chebyshev-Nikishin polynomials P_n. Section 4 proves Proposition 1.4 on the ratio asymptotics of the polynomials P_n. In Section 5 we use these considerations to prove Theorem 1.2. In Section 6 we prove Theorem 1.3. In Section 7 we prove Theorem 1.1 on the relations between the coefficients $b_{i,j}$ in (1.7). In Section 8 we obtain strong asymptotics and exact Widom-type formulas for the second kind functions $\Psi_{n,l}(z)$ in (1.25)–(1.26). Finally, Section 9 discusses the generalization of our results to some alternative systems of multi-indices $\mathbf{n}$.

2 Multiple orthogonality relations for banded Hessenberg operators

In this section we recall some general results on multiple orthogonality relations for banded Hessenberg matrices, following Kaliaguine [16], see also Van Iseghem [26] and Kaliaguine [17]. We consider a banded Hessenberg matrix A with $p+2$ diagonals of the form (1.5). We associate to A the following sequences of polynomials that we denote by $(q_n)_n$ and $(p_n^{(j)})_n$, where $j \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$. We require these polynomials to satisfy the recurrence relation

$$zy_n = y_{n+1} + a_{n,n}\, y_n + a_{n,n-1}\, y_{n-1} + \cdots + a_{n,n-p}\, y_{n-p}, \qquad n \geq 0, \tag{2.1}$$

with initial conditions

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
n & = & -p & -p+1 & -p+2 & \ldots & -1 & 0 \\
\hline
p_n^{(1)} & = & 1 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & 0 \\
p_n^{(2)} & = & 0 & 1 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & 0 \\
p_n^{(3)} & = & 0 & 0 & 1 & \ldots & 0 & 0 \\
\vdots & & & & & \vdots & & \\
p_n^{(p)} & = & 0 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 1 & 0 \\
q_n & = & 0 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & 1
\end{array} \tag{2.2}$$

In our definition, we take $a_{i,j} = -1$ for $0 \leq i \leq p-1$ and $j \leq -1$. Observe that for $n \geq 0$, q_n is a polynomial of degree n and $p_n^{(j)}$ is a polynomial of degree $n-1$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$.

Let A_n be the truncation of A to the first n rows and columns. We define

$$D_n(z) := \det(zI_n - A_n), \tag{2.3}$$

$$D_n^{(j)}(z) := \det(zI_{n-j} - (A_n)^{[1,\dots,j;1,\dots,j]}), \qquad 1 \le j \le p, \tag{2.4}$$

where I_k denotes the identity matrix of size k, and $M^{[1,\dots,j;1,\dots,j]}$ denotes the submatrix of M obtained after deleting the first j rows and columns. Of course, we set

$$D_0(z) \equiv D_1^{(1)}(z) \equiv D_2^{(2)}(z) \equiv \cdots \equiv D_p^{(p)}(z) \equiv 1,$$

and we take $D_n(z) \equiv 0$, $n < 0$, and $D_n^{(j)}(z) \equiv 0$, $n < j$.

Expanding D_n by its last row, it is easy to check that

$$q_n = D_n, \qquad n \ge 0$$

since both sequences satisfy the same recurrence relation and initial conditions. We also have

Lemma 2.1. *The following relation holds for every* $j \in \{1,\dots,p\}$*:*

$$p_n^{(j)} = D_n^{(1)} + D_n^{(2)} + \cdots + D_n^{(j)}, \qquad n \ge 0. \tag{2.5}$$

Proof. It easily follows from the definition (2.4) that the sequence of polynomials $D_n^{(j)}$ satisfies the recurrence relation

$$zD_n^{(j)}(z) = D_{n+1}^{(j)}(z) + a_{n,n}\, D_n^{(j)}(z) + a_{n,n-1}\, D_{n-1}^{(j)}(z) + \cdots + a_{n,n-p}\, D_{n-p}^{(j)}(z), \qquad n \ge j. \tag{2.6}$$

Since $p_1^{(1)}(z) = 1 = D_1^{(1)}(z)$, and $p_n^{(1)} = D_n^{(1)} = 0$ for $1-p \le n \le 0$, it follows from (2.1) and (2.6) that $p_n^{(1)} = D_n^{(1)}$ for all $n \ge 0$.

Next we show that

$$p_n^{(j)}(z) - p_n^{(j-1)}(z) = D_n^{(j)}(z) \qquad \text{for all } n \ge 0. \tag{2.7}$$

Evidently,

$$z(p_n^{(j)} - p_n^{(j-1)}) = p_{n+1}^{(j)} - p_{n+1}^{(j-1)} + a_{n,n}(p_n^{(j)} - p_n^{(j-1)}) + \cdots + a_{n,n-p}(p_{n-p}^{(j)} - p_{n-p}^{(j-1)}), \qquad n \ge 0. \tag{2.8}$$

Recall that the initial conditions (2.2) hold, in particular $p_{j-1-p}^{(j)} = 1$ and $p_{j-2-p}^{(j-1)} = 1$. By definition, $a_{k,j} = -1$ for $0 \le k \le p-1$ and $j \le -1$, so if we set $n = 0$ in (2.8) we get $p_1^{(j)} - p_1^{(j-1)} = 0$. If we continue evaluating n from 1 to $j-2$ in (2.8), we obtain $p_n^{(j)} - p_n^{(j-1)} = 0$ for $2 \le n \le j-1$. Therefore (2.7) holds for $0 \le n \le j-1$.

If we now put $n = j-1$ in (2.8), we get $p_j^{(j)} - p_j^{(j-1)} = 1 = D_j^{(j)}$. And now (2.7) will follow immediately from (2.8), (2.6), and the fact that $p_n^{(j)} - p_n^{(j-1)} = D_n^{(j)}$ for $j-p \le n \le j$. Therefore (2.5) can be proved now by induction on j. □

We recall some results due to Kaliaguine [16, 17], see also Van Iseghem [26]. In order to state these results, we introduce some notation. We will assume that the coefficients of the matrix A are uniformly bounded. Let $\{\mathbf{e}_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ denote the standard basis in l^2, and consider the following resolvent functions

$$g_j(z) := (R_z \mathbf{e}_{j-1}, \mathbf{e}_0), \qquad 1 \le j \le p, \tag{2.9}$$

where $R_z = (zI - A)^{-1}$ is the resolvent operator, and $(\cdot,\cdot)$ is the standard inner product in l^2. We also define

$$\phi_j(z) := g_1(z) + g_2(z) + \cdots + g_j(z), \qquad 1 \le j \le p. \tag{2.10}$$

For each $j = 1, \dots, p$, we introduce a linear functional L_j defined on the space of polynomials by

$$L_j(z^n) = (A^n \mathbf{v}_j, \mathbf{e}_0),$$

where $\mathbf{v}_j := \mathbf{e}_0 + \cdots + \mathbf{e}_{j-1}$. Observe that the sequence $(\mu_{j,n})_{n=0}^{\infty} = (L_j(z^n))_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is the sequence of "moments" for ϕ_j, in the sense that

$$\phi_j(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_{j,n}}{z^{n+1}},$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$ sufficiently large.

Theorem 2.2 (See [16, 26])**.** *a) The vector of rational functions*

$$\Big(\frac{p_n^{(1)}}{q_n}, \frac{p_n^{(2)}}{q_n}, \dots, \frac{p_n^{(p)}}{q_n}\Big)$$

is a Hermite-Padé approximant to the system $(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_p)$, with respect to the multi-index $\mathbf{n}$ in (1.2). That is, for each $j = 1, \dots, p$, we have

$$q_n(z)\phi_j(z) - p_n^{(j)}(z) = O\Big(\frac{1}{z^{n_j+1}}\Big), \qquad z \to \infty,$$

where n_j is the j-th component of $\mathbf{n}$.

b) For each $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, the polynomial q_n satisfies the following orthogonality conditions:

$$L_j(q_n z^l) = 0, \qquad l = 0, \dots, n_j - 1.$$

Remark 2.3. Making use of Theorem 2.2 and Lemma 2.1, by linearity we obtain that

$$\Big(\frac{D_n^{(1)}}{D_n}, \frac{D_n^{(1)} + c_{1,1}D_n^{(2)}}{D_n}, \dots, \frac{D_n^{(1)} + c_{1,p-1}D_n^{(2)} + c_{2,p-1}D_n^{(3)} + \cdots + c_{p-1,p-1}D_n^{(p)}}{D_n}\Big)$$

is a Hermite-Padé approximant to the system of functions

$$(g_1, g_1 + c_{1,1}g_2, g_1 + c_{1,2}g_2 + c_{2,2}g_3, \dots, g_1 + c_{1,p-1}g_2 + \cdots + c_{p-1,p-1}g_p),$$

with respect to the multi-index (1.2). Here, $c_{i,j}$ denote arbitrary constants.

The recent survey [4] contains information on the latest developments in the theory of Hermite-Padé approximation, multiple orthogonal polynomials, and their applications to random matrix theory.

3 Chebyshev-Nikishin polynomials

In this section we apply the results of Section 2 to the Chebyshev-Nikishin polynomials $(P_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ defined by (1.7)–(1.13). To this end it is convenient to use an alternative determinantal formula for P_n. In fact, if we applied the results of Section 2 directly to the operator T in (1.8) then we would need to control the limiting ratios

$$\frac{\det\left(zI_{n-j}-(T_n)^{[1,\ldots,j;1,\ldots,j]}\right)}{\det(zI_n-T_n)}$$

for $n\to\infty$ and for fixed $j=1,\ldots,p$. These limiting ratios are hard to deal with. Therefore we use a different approach. We will use a reflection of T_n with respect to its main anti-diagonal, which turns the above ratios into expressions of the form

$$\frac{\det(zI_{n-j}-T_{n-j})}{\det(zI_n-T_n)}\equiv\frac{P_{n-j}(z)}{P_n(z)}.$$

Note that the matrix in the numerator of the left hand side, is obtained from the matrix in the denominator by skipping its *last* j rows and columns (rather than the *first* j rows and columns, thanks to the anti-diagonal reflection.) The limiting ratios for $n\to\infty$ will then be obtained with the help of equation (1.21) (depending on the residue class of n modulo p).

Now we work out the above ideas in detail. For a fixed $k\in\{0,\ldots,p-1\}$, let

$$T^{(k)}:=T^{[1,\ldots,k;1,\ldots,k]},$$

i.e., $T^{(k)}$ is the infinite matrix obtained by deleting the first k rows and columns of T. Of course, we understand that $T^{(0)}=T$. Note that $T^{(k)}$ is also a tridiagonal block Toeplitz matrix

$$T^{(k)}=\begin{pmatrix} B_0^{(k)} & B_{-1}^{(k)} & & & \\ B_1^{(k)} & B_0^{(k)} & B_{-1}^{(k)} & & \\ & B_1^{(k)} & B_0^{(k)} & B_{-1}^{(k)} & \\ & & B_1^{(k)} & B_0^{(k)} & \ddots \\ & & & \ddots & \ddots \end{pmatrix},$$

where the blocks of $T^{(k)}$ are also of size $p\times p$ and can be computed easily. Let Π_p be the $p\times p$ permutation matrix that consists of 1's in the main anti-diagonal and 0's elsewhere, i.e.

$$\Pi_p(i,j)=\begin{cases}1, & \text{if } i+j=p+1,\\ 0, & \text{otherwise,}\end{cases}\tag{3.1}$$

where $\Pi_p(i,j)$ represents the entry in row i and column j of Π_p. We construct now a new block Toeplitz matrix $\widetilde{T}^{(k)}$ as follows:

$$\widetilde{T}^{(k)}=\begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{B}_0^{(k)} & \widetilde{B}_{-1}^{(k)} & & & \\ \widetilde{B}_1^{(k)} & \widetilde{B}_0^{(k)} & \widetilde{B}_{-1}^{(k)} & & \\ & \widetilde{B}_1^{(k)} & \widetilde{B}_0^{(k)} & \widetilde{B}_{-1}^{(k)} & \\ & & \widetilde{B}_1^{(k)} & \widetilde{B}_0^{(k)} & \ddots \\ & & & \ddots & \ddots \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$\widetilde{B}_i^{(k)}=\Pi_p(B_i^{(k)})^T\Pi_p,\qquad i=-1,0,1,$$

where the superscript ^{T} stands for the matrix transposition. So the block $\widetilde{B}_i^{(k)}$ is obtained by reflecting $B_i^{(k)}$ with respect to its main anti-diagonal.

Lemma 3.1. *Fix $n = mp + k$, with $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $k \in \{0, 1, \ldots, p-1\}$. Then the Chebyshev-Nikishin polynomials $\{P_{n-j}\}_{j=0}^{n}$ are obtained by the formulas*

$$P_{n-j}(z) = \det(zI_{n-j} - (\widetilde{T}_n^{(k)})^{[1,\ldots,j;1,\ldots,j]}), \qquad 0 \leq j \leq n, \tag{3.2}$$

where I_{n-j} is the identity matrix of size $n-j$ and $\widetilde{T}_n^{(k)}$ is the truncation of $\widetilde{T}^{(k)}$ to the first n columns and rows.

Proof. Formula (3.2) follows directly from the relation $\widetilde{T}_n^{(k)} = \Pi_n \, T_n \, \Pi_n^T$, where Π_n is the $n \times n$ permutation matrix defined as in (3.1). ☐

We keep $n = mp + k$ fixed in what follows. If we set $A = \widetilde{T}^{(k)}$, then Lemma 3.1 asserts that the polynomials $\{P_{n-j}\}_{j=0}^{p}$ are of the form $D_n^{(j)}$, cf. (2.3)–(2.4). So (see Remark 2.3) we know that

$$\Big(\frac{P_{n-1}}{P_n}, \frac{P_{n-1} + c_{1,1}P_{n-2}}{P_n}, \ldots, \frac{P_{n-1} + c_{1,p-1}P_{n-2} + c_{2,p-1}P_{n-3} + \cdots + c_{p-1,p-1}P_{n-p}}{P_n}\Big) \tag{3.3}$$

is a Hermite-Padé approximant to the system of functions

$$(g_1^{(k)}, g_1^{(k)} + c_{1,1}g_2^{(k)}, g_1^{(k)} + c_{1,2}g_2^{(k)} + c_{2,2}g_3^{(k)}, \ldots, g_1^{(k)} + c_{1,p-1}g_2^{(k)} + \cdots + c_{p-1,p-1}g_p^{(k)}),$$

with respect to the multi-index (1.2) and the functions $g_i^{(k)}$ are the resolvent functions (2.9) associated with the operator $\widetilde{T}^{(k)}$.

4 Proof of Proposition 1.4

In this section we prove Proposition 1.4 on the ratio asymptotics of the Chebyshev-Nikishin polynomials P_n. In the next section we will use this to prove Theorems 1.2 and 1.3.

Recall the notations in Section 1.4. Since the block Toeplitz matrix T in (1.8)–(1.10) has a lower Hessenberg shape, each set Γ_k in (1.19) is non-empty and is a finite union of analytic arcs, see [10, Prop. 1.1 and Lemma 2.1]. From [1] or [10, Example 5.3] (or straightforward verification) we also know that the roots $z_k(x)$ in (1.18) have the asymptotics

$$\begin{aligned} &z_1(x) = \tfrac{1}{x^p} + O\Big(\tfrac{1}{x^{p+1}}\Big), \quad x \to \infty, \\ &C_1|x| < |z_k(x)| < C_2|x|, \quad x \to \infty, \quad 2 \leq k \leq p+1, \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

for certain constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$. Therefore Γ_1 is compact.

We also need some results and notations from [5]. Let $\mathcal{R}$ denote the compact Riemann surface

$$\mathcal{R} = \overline{\bigcup_{k=0}^{p} \mathcal{R}_k}$$

formed by gluing in the usual crosswise manner the consecutive sheets

$$\mathcal{R}_0 := \overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \Delta_1, \qquad \mathcal{R}_k = \overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus (\Delta_k \cup \Delta_{k+1}), \quad k = 1, \ldots, p-1, \qquad \mathcal{R}_p := \overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \Delta_p.$$

Let $\psi^{(k)}$, $k = 1, \ldots, p$, denote the meromorphic function on $\mathcal{R}$ whose divisor consists of a simple pole at $\infty^{(0)} \in \mathcal{R}_0$ and a simple zero at $\infty^{(k)} \in \mathcal{R}_k$, with the normalization

$$\psi^{(k)}(z) = z + O(1), \qquad z \to \infty^{(0)}.$$

Here $\infty^{(k)}$ denotes the point at infinity on the sheet $\mathcal{R}_k$. Let $\psi_j^{(k)}$ denote the restriction of $\psi^{(k)}$ to the sheet $\mathcal{R}_j$. The main result of [5] asserts that

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{Q_{mp+k}(z)}{Q_{mp+k-1}(z)} =: F_k(z) = \psi_0^{(k)}(z), \qquad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_1, \quad k = 1, \ldots, p, \tag{4.2}$$

recall (1.6). From Liouville's Theorem we deduce that for any pair of indices j, k, the function $\psi^{(j)} - \psi^{(k)}$ is constant on $\mathcal{R}$. In particular, $F_j - F_k$ is also constant.

From the recurrence

$$zQ_{mp+k} = Q_{mp+k+1} + a_{mp+k,mp+k} Q_{mp+k} + \cdots + a_{mp+k,mp+k-p} Q_{mp+k-p},$$

dividing by Q_{mp+k} and taking the limit as $m \to \infty$, we deduce that for each $k \in \{0, \ldots, p-1\}$,

$$z = F_{k+1} + b_{k,k} + b_{k,k-1} \frac{1}{F_k} + b_{k,k-2} \frac{1}{F_k\, F_{k-1}} + \cdots + b_{k,k-p} \frac{1}{F_k \cdots F_{k-p+1}}, \tag{4.3}$$

with the obvious identifications $b_{k,k-i} = b_{p+k,p+k-i}$ if $i > k$ and $F_{k-i} = F_{p+k-i}$ if $i \geq k$ (cf. (1.6) and (1.7)). Multiplying both sides of (4.3) by $F_k \cdots F_{k-p+1}$, we obtain

$$zF_k \cdots F_{k-p+1} = F_{k+1} F_k \cdots F_{k-p+1} + b_{k,k} F_k \cdots F_{k-p+1} + \cdots + b_{k,k-p+1} F_{k+1} + b_{k,k-p}. \tag{4.4}$$

Except for the term $b_{k,k-p}$, all the other terms in (4.4) contain a factor $F_{k+1} \equiv F_{k-p+1}$. Writing all the functions F_j, $j \neq k+1$, as F_{k+1} plus some constant, we arrive at an algebraic equation of degree $p+1$ satisfied by $F_{k+1}(z) = \psi_0^{(k+1)}(z)$ of the form

$$F_{k+1}(z)^{p+1} + C_p(z)\, F_{k+1}(z)^p + \cdots + C_1(z)\, F_{k+1}(z) + b_{k,k-p} = 0.$$

By analytic continuation, this equation is also satisfied by the other branches $\psi_i^{(k+1)}$, $i = 1, \ldots, p$. It follows that

$$b_{k,k-p} \equiv (-1)^{p+1} \prod_{i=0}^{p} \psi_i^{(k+1)}(z), \qquad z \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}. \tag{4.5}$$

In particular we have that $f_p \neq 0$, see (1.23). This allows us to write (1.22).

Recall the strong asymptotics in (1.24). We remark that the function $\det F^{[p,k+1]}(z_1(x), x)$ in (1.24) has at most a finite number of zeros outside Γ_1. Indeed, the contrary would mean that $\det F^{[p,k+1]}(z_1(x), x)$ is identically zero as a function of x, which by analytic continuation would imply that *each* of the coefficients in Widom's formula (1.22) for $P_{mp+k}(x)$ is identically zero. But then $P_{mp+k}(x) \equiv 0$, which is clearly a contradiction; see also [10, Lemma 5.7].

From (1.24) we deduce that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{P_n(x)}{P_{n+p}(x)} = z_1(x) \tag{4.6}$$

and

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{P_{mp+k}(x)}{P_{mp}(x)} = (-1)^k \frac{\det F^{[p,k+1]}(z_1(x), x)}{\det F^{[p,1]}(z_1(x), x)}, \qquad k = 0, \ldots, p-1, \tag{4.7}$$

uniformly on each compact subset of $\mathbb{C} \setminus (\Gamma_1 \cup \mathcal{A})$ with $\mathcal{A}$ a finite set.

We want to relate the ratio asymptotics in (4.7) and (4.2). Recall that all the zeros of all the polynomials Q_n are contained in the interval Δ_1, and that the zeros of Q_n and Q_{n+1} interlace (see [5, Theorem 2.1]). We can then apply [7, Section 4] (taking into account that we do not know yet that $\Gamma_1 \subset \mathbb{R}$) and obtain for all $x \in \mathbb{C}$ sufficiently large that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{Q_n(x)}{Q_{n+p}(x)} = z_1(x).$$

Moreover, [7, Remark 4.2] shows that the vector

$$\mathbf{Q}(x) := \lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{1}{Q_{mp}(x)} \begin{pmatrix} Q_{mp}(x) \\ \vdots \\ Q_{mp+p-1}(x) \end{pmatrix}$$

satisfies the matrix-vector product relation

$$F(z_1(x), x)\mathbf{Q}(x) = \mathbf{0},$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{C}$ sufficiently large. From the interlacing of zeros we know that all the limiting ratios $\lim_{m\to\infty} Q_{mp+k}(x)/Q_{mp}(x)$ are analytic in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_1$. Thus we get by analytic continuation that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{Q_n(x)}{Q_{n+p}(x)} = \tilde{z}_1(x), \qquad x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_1, \tag{4.8}$$

and

$$F(\tilde{z}_1(x), x)\mathbf{Q}(x) = \mathbf{0}, \qquad x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_1, \tag{4.9}$$

where $\tilde{z}_1(x)$ is the (unique) root of the algebraic equation $f(z, x) = 0$ that satisfies $\tilde{z}_1(x) \sim x^{-p}$ for $x \to \infty$ and that depends analytically on $x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_1$. Obviously $\tilde{z}_1(x) = z_1(x)$ for all x large enough. We will see further that $\tilde{z}_1(x) = z_1(x)$ holds for *all* $x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_1$.

From the above discussion we see in particular that the root $z_1(x)$ can be analytically continued from a neighborhood of infinity to $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_1$.

Applying Cramer's rule to (4.9) gives us

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{Q_{mp+k}(x)}{Q_{mp}(x)} = (-1)^k \frac{\det F^{[p,k+1]}(\tilde{z}_1(x), x)}{\det F^{[p,1]}(\tilde{z}_1(x), x)}, \qquad x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_1, \tag{4.10}$$

for all $k = 0, \ldots, p-1$. Comparing this with (4.6)–(4.7), we see that the proof of (1.21) will be obtained once we know that $\tilde{z}_1(x) = z_1(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_1$.

Incidentally, we point out that an alternative proof of (4.8) and (4.10) could be constructed with the help of the generalized Poincaré theorem in [23], rather than using [7].

From (4.2) and (4.8) we see that

$$\tilde{z}_1(x) = \frac{1}{\psi_0^{(1)}(x) \ldots \psi_0^{(p)}(x)} = \frac{1}{F_1(x) \ldots F_p(x)}, \qquad x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_1. \tag{4.11}$$

The right hand side can be analytically extended to a meromorphic function on the Riemann surface $\mathcal{R}$, with restriction to the sheet $\mathcal{R}_{k-1}$ given by

$$\tilde{z}_k(x) := \frac{1}{\psi_{k-1}^{(1)}(x) \ldots \psi_{k-1}^{(p)}(x)}, \qquad x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (\Delta_{k-1} \cup \Delta_k), \tag{4.12}$$

for $k = 1, \ldots, p+1$, where we understand that $\Delta_0 = \emptyset = \Delta_{p+1}$. Thus $\tilde{z}_k(x)$ and $\tilde{z}_{k+1}(x)$ are each others analytic continuation across Δ_k. From the uniqueness of analytic continuation we then get that for each $x \in \mathbb{C}$, $\tilde{z}_1(x), \ldots, \tilde{z}_{p+1}(x)$ are a permutation of the roots $z_1(x), \ldots, z_{p+1}(x)$ of the algebraic equation $f(z,x) = 0$. If we would be able to prove that

$$|\tilde{z}_1(x)| \leq |\tilde{z}_2(x)| \leq \cdots \leq |\tilde{z}_{p+1}(x)|, \qquad x \in \mathbb{C}, \tag{4.13}$$

and

$$|\tilde{z}_k(x)| < |\tilde{z}_{k+1}(x)|, \qquad x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_k, \tag{4.14}$$

then we could conclude from (1.18) that $\tilde{z}_k(x) = z_k(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (\Delta_{k-1} \cup \Delta_k)$.

The rest of the proof is devoted to proving (4.13)–(4.14). We will do this by a rather intricate argument involving the total masses of certain equilibrium measures. An alternative proof may be found in [1, Propositions 2.1–2.2].

To start, we define a measure s_k on Δ_k with density

$$\mathrm{d}s_k(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\left(\frac{\tilde{z}'_{k,+}(x)}{\tilde{z}_{k,+}(x)} - \frac{\tilde{z}'_{k,-}(x)}{\tilde{z}_{k,-}(x)}\right)\mathrm{d}x, \qquad x \in \Delta_k, \tag{4.15}$$

$k = 1, \ldots, p$, where the prime denotes the derivative with respect to x, and where the $+$ and $-$ subscripts stand for the boundary values obtained from the upper or lower half of the complex plane respectively. Note that the density (4.15) is well-defined in the interior of Δ_k, and blows up at worst like an inverse square root at the endpoints of Δ_k (this follows from the representation of $\tilde{z}_k$ in local coordinates near the endpoints). We claim that s_k is a real-valued (possibly signed) measure on Δ_k with total mass

$$s_k(\Delta_k) := \int_{\Delta_k} \mathrm{d}s_k(x) = p + 1 - k, \qquad k = 1, \ldots, p. \tag{4.16}$$

To prove Equation (4.16), we first derive the following relation for the Cauchy transforms:

$$\int_{\Delta_{k-1}} \frac{1}{x-t}\,\mathrm{d}s_{k-1}(t) - \int_{\Delta_k} \frac{1}{x-t}\,\mathrm{d}s_k(t) = \frac{\tilde{z}'_k(x)}{\tilde{z}_k(x)}, \qquad x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (\Delta_{k-1} \cup \Delta_k), \tag{4.17}$$

for $k = 1, \ldots, p$, where we understand that $\Delta_0 = \emptyset$ and $s_0 = 0$. Indeed, equation (4.17) follows easily by contour deformation and by using that $\tilde{z}_{k-1,\pm}(x) = \tilde{z}_{k,\mp}(x)$ for $x \in \Delta_{k-1}$.

From

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{z}_1(x) \sim x^{-p}, && x \to \infty, \\ &\tilde{z}_k(x) \sim C_k x, && x \to \infty, \quad 2 \leq k \leq p+1, \end{aligned}$$

we get for the logarithmic derivatives that

$$\frac{\tilde{z}'_k(x)}{\tilde{z}_k(x)} \sim \begin{cases} -p/x, & k = 1, \\ 1/x, & k = 2, \ldots, p, \end{cases}$$

for $x \to \infty$. Thus by equating the $1/x$ terms in the asymptotics for $x \to \infty$ in both sides of (4.17) we obtain

$$s_{k-1}(\Delta_{k-1}) - s_k(\Delta_k) = \begin{cases} -p, & k = 1, \\ 1, & k = 2, \ldots, p. \end{cases}$$

The claim (4.16) follows from this by means of an upward induction on $k = 1, \ldots, p$.

The symmetry under complex conjugation shows that $\tilde{z}_k(\bar{x}) = \overline{\tilde{z}_k(x)}$ where the bar denotes the complex conjugation. We then obtain from (4.15)–(4.16) that

$$\frac{1}{\pi}\int_{\Delta_k} \operatorname{Im}\left(\frac{\tilde{z}'_{k,+}(x)}{\tilde{z}_{k,+}(x)}\right) \mathrm{d}x = p+1-k, \tag{4.18}$$

with Im denoting the imaginary part of a complex number.

On the other hand, consider the (positive) measure σ_k on Γ_k with density [10]

$$\mathrm{d}\sigma_k(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\left(\frac{z'_{j,+}(x)}{z_{j,+}(x)} - \frac{z'_{j,-}(x)}{z_{j,-}(x)}\right)\mathrm{d}x, \qquad x \in \Gamma_k. \tag{4.19}$$

This measure is well-defined on each open analytic arc of Γ_k, recalling that Γ_k is a finite union of analytic arcs. Note that we are using the roots z_j and not $\tilde{z}_j$. The measure σ_k, restricted to the real line, takes the form

$$\mathrm{d}\sigma_k(x) = \frac{1}{\pi}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\operatorname{Im}\left(\frac{z'_{j,+}(x)}{z_{j,+}(x)}\right)\mathrm{d}x, \qquad x \in \Gamma_k \cap \mathbb{R}. \tag{4.20}$$

Now, let us take a fixed open interval $J \subset \mathbb{R}$ that does not contain any intersection points or endpoints of the analytic arcs constituting Γ_k, for every k. We also ask J not to contain isolated intersection points of the sets Γ_k with the real axis. Thus there exists an open connected set $U \subset \mathbb{C}$ such that $U \cap \mathbb{R} = J$ and moreover $U \cap \Gamma_k$ is either empty or equal to J, for any $k = 1, \ldots, p$. The boundary values $z_{k,+}(x)$ for $x \in J$ are then uniquely defined and they vary analytically with x.

On the interval J, there exist indices $1 \leq m_1 < m_2 < \ldots < m_L \leq p$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}|z_{1,+}(x)| = \ldots = |z_{m_1,+}(x)| < |z_{m_1+1,+}(x)| = \ldots = |z_{m_2,+}(x)| < \ldots \\ < |z_{m_L+1,+}(x)| = \ldots = |z_{p+1,+}(x)|,\end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

for all $x \in J$. We define $m_0 := 0$ and $m_{L+1} := p+1$.

We will see later that $m_{k+1} - m_k \in \{1, 2\}$ for all k, i.e., each "cluster" $|z_{m_k+1,+}(x)| = \ldots = |z_{m_{k+1},+}(x)|$ in (4.21) can only have length 1 or 2.

From the ordering (1.18) we find for each of the clusters $|z_{m_k+1,+}(x)| = \ldots = |z_{m_{k+1},+}(x)|$ in (4.21) that

$$\left[\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\epsilon}\left(\operatorname{Re}\log z_{m_k+1}(x+i\epsilon)\right)\right]_{\epsilon=0+} \leq \ldots \leq \left[\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\epsilon}\left(\operatorname{Re}\log z_{m_{k+1}}(x+i\epsilon)\right)\right]_{\epsilon=0+}, \qquad x \in J,$$

for any $k = 0, \ldots, L$. Using the Cauchy-Riemann equations this implies

$$\operatorname{Im}\left(\frac{z'_{m_k+1,+}(x)}{z_{m_k+1,+}(x)}\right) \geq \ldots \geq \operatorname{Im}\left(\frac{z'_{m_{k+1},+}(x)}{z_{m_{k+1},+}(x)}\right), \qquad x \in J, \tag{4.22}$$

$k = 0, \ldots, L$.

By the symmetry with respect to complex conjugation we have a pairing of the numbers in (4.22): they appear in positive-negative pairs in the sense that

$$\operatorname{Im}\left(\frac{z'_{m_k+j,+}(x)}{z_{m_k+j,+}(x)}\right) = -\operatorname{Im}\left(\frac{z'_{m_{k+1}+1-j,+}(x)}{z_{m_{k+1}+1-j,+}(x)}\right), \qquad j = 1, \ldots, m_{k+1} - m_k, \tag{4.23}$$

for any $x \in J$ and $k = 0, \ldots, L$. Note that the numbers in (4.22) can also be identically zero, in the case of a real-valued root. Clearly there is at least one real root if $m_{k+1} - m_k$ is odd.

Let $\tilde{m}_k := \left\lfloor \frac{m_k + m_{k+1}}{2} \right\rfloor$. From the above considerations we find for the density of the measure $\sigma_{\tilde{m}_k}$ in (4.20) that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{d}\sigma_{\tilde{m}_k}(x)}{\mathrm{d}x} &= \frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{j=m_k+1}^{\tilde{m}_k} \operatorname{Im}\left(\frac{z'_{j,+}(x)}{z_{j,+}(x)}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{j=m_k+1}^{m_{k+1}} \left| \operatorname{Im}\left(\frac{z'_{j,+}(x)}{z_{j,+}(x)}\right) \right|, \qquad x \in J,\end{aligned}$$

for any $k = 0, \ldots, L$, where the first equality follows from the cancelations arising from (4.23), and the second equality follows from (4.22)–(4.23). Hence the sum of the total masses of all the measures σ_k over the interval J can be bounded from below by

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_1(J) + \ldots + \sigma_p(J) &\geq \sigma_{\tilde{m}_0}(J) + \ldots + \sigma_{\tilde{m}_L}(J) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_J \sum_{j=1}^{p+1} \left| \operatorname{Im}\left(\frac{z'_{j,+}(x)}{z_{j,+}(x)}\right) \right| \mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned} \tag{4.24}$$

Putting $\Delta := \bigcup_{k=1}^{p} \Delta_k$ we then obtain

$$\sigma_1(\Delta) + \ldots + \sigma_p(\Delta) \geq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_\Delta \sum_{j=1}^{p+1} \left| \operatorname{Im}\left(\frac{z'_{j,+}(x)}{z_{j,+}(x)}\right) \right| \mathrm{d}x. \tag{4.25}$$

On the other hand, the (positive) measure σ_k satisfies [10, Cor. 4.2] (or see the proof of (4.16))

$$\sigma_k(\Delta) \leq \sigma_k(\mathbb{C}) = \sigma_k(\Gamma_k) = p + 1 - k, \tag{4.26}$$

for $k = 1, \ldots, p$. Using this in (4.25) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=1}^{p} (p+1-k) &\geq \sum_{k=1}^{p} \sigma_k(\Delta) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_\Delta \sum_{k=1}^{p+1} \left| \operatorname{Im}\left(\frac{z'_{k,+}(x)}{z_{k,+}(x)}\right) \right| \mathrm{d}x \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_\Delta \sum_{k=1}^{p+1} \left| \operatorname{Im}\left(\frac{\tilde{z}'_{k,+}(x)}{\tilde{z}_{k,+}(x)}\right) \right| \mathrm{d}x \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{k=1}^{p} \int_{\Delta_k} \left| \operatorname{Im}\left(\frac{\tilde{z}'_{k,+}(x)}{\tilde{z}_{k,+}(x)}\right) \right| \mathrm{d}x \\ &\geq \sum_{k=1}^{p} (p+1-k),\end{aligned}$$

where the second relation is (4.25), and the third one follows since the roots $\tilde{z}_k$ form a permutation of the roots z_k. The fourth relation uses that on Δ_k there are precisely two non-real roots $\tilde{z}_k(x)$ and $\tilde{z}_{k+1}(x)$, which are complex conjugated. Finally the last inequality is (4.18).

From the above chain of inequalities we find:

Lemma 4.1. (*a*) *We have*

$$\Gamma_k \subset \Delta = \bigcup_{j=1}^{p} \Delta_j, \qquad k = 1, \ldots, p. \tag{4.27}$$

(*b*) *Clusters of length* ≥ 3 *in* (4.21) *cannot occur unless they have all entries in* (4.22) *equal to zero.*

Proof of Lemma 4.1. (a) By comparing the two outermost terms in the above chain of inequalities, we see that each of the inequalities $\geq$ is actually an equality. Since the first inequality in the chain comes from (4.26), this implies in particular that $\sigma_k(\Delta) = \sigma_k(\mathbb{C}) = \sigma_k(\Gamma_k) = p+1-k$ for all k. This implies (4.27), since each analytic arc of Γ_k has a strictly positive mass under σ_k.

Let us prove the statement made in the last sentence. We note that the product $z_1(x)\ldots z_k(x)$ is analytic in $\mathbb{C}\setminus\Gamma_k$ [13, Prop. 3.5] and moreover, by splitting the analytic arcs of Γ_k into finitely many sub-arcs if necessary, the analytic continuation of $z_1(x)\ldots z_k(x)$ across each such sub-arc is of the form $z_{j_1}(x)\ldots z_{j_k}(x)$ with $\{j_1,\ldots,j_k\} \neq \{1,\ldots,k\}$ [13, Prop. 3.4]. This then implies that $\log|z_1(x)\ldots z_k(x)|$ is nowhere harmonic on Γ_k. Since $-\log|z_1(x)\ldots z_k(x)| + C$ (for some constant C) is the logarithmic potential of the measure σ_k in (4.19) [10, Prop. 5.10], we then conclude from the non-harmonicity that σ_k is indeed nontrivial on each sub-arc of Γ_k. This proves the claim.

(b) From the strictness of the inequalities $\geq$ in the above chain of inequalities, we also get that the inequality $\geq$ in (4.24) is an equality. This is easily seen to imply Part (b). ☐

Now we are in a position to prove (1.20). First we will prove that $\Gamma_1 = \Delta_1$. From (4.27) we already know that $\Gamma_1 \subset \Delta$. Then the equality $\tilde{z}_1(x) = z_1(x)$, which is known to hold for all x sufficiently large, remains valid for all $x \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\Delta$. Using this, we find

$$z_{1,+}(x) = \tilde{z}_{1,+}(x) = \tilde{z}_{1,-}(x) = z_{1,-}(x), \qquad x \in \Delta\setminus\Delta_1,$$

where we used that $\tilde{z}_1(x)$ is analytic away from Δ_1. Hence $z_1(x)$ is analytic on $\Delta\setminus\Delta_1$ and then [13, Prop. 3.4] implies that $(\Delta\setminus\Delta_1)\cap\Gamma_1 = \emptyset$ and so $\Gamma_1 \subset \Delta_1$. The reverse inclusion $\Delta_1 \subset \Gamma_1$ is immediate since $z_{1,+}(x) = \tilde{z}_{1,+}(x) = \overline{\tilde{z}_{1,-}(x)} = \overline{z_{1,-}(x)}$ for $x \in \Delta_1$, yielding two different roots with the same modulus. This proves that $\Gamma_1 = \Delta_1$.

From the non-triviality of σ_1 on $\Gamma_1 = \Delta_1$ (see the proof of Lemma 4.1(a)), we have that $\mathrm{Im}\left(\frac{z_{1,+}'(x)}{z_{1,+}(x)}\right) \neq 0$ for almost all $x \in \Delta_1$. Thus the cluster $\mathrm{Im}\left(\frac{z_{1,+}'(x)}{z_{1,+}(x)}\right) \geq \ldots \geq \mathrm{Im}\left(\frac{z_{m_1,+}'(x)}{z_{m_1,+}(x)}\right)$ on the interval Δ_1 has length $m_1 \leq 2$, in view of Lemma 4.1(b). On the other hand, we also have that $m_1 \geq 2$, since $\tilde{z}_{1,\pm}(x) = \tilde{z}_{2,\mp}(x)$ are complex conjugate for $x \in \Delta_1$. Thus $m_1 = 2$. This also shows that $z_2(x) = \tilde{z}_2(x)$ for all x near Δ_1 and therefore for all $x \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\Delta$, since $\Gamma_2 \subset \Delta$ (again from (4.27)).

Now we prove that $\Gamma_2 = \Delta_2$. In view of the last paragraph we have

$$z_{1,+}(x)z_{2,+}(x) = \tilde{z}_{1,+}(x)\tilde{z}_{2,+}(x) = \tilde{z}_{1,-}(x)\tilde{z}_{2,-}(x) = z_{1,-}(x)z_{2,-}(x), \qquad x \in \Delta\setminus\Delta_2,$$

where we used that the product $\tilde{z}_1\tilde{z}_2$ is analytic away from Δ_2. Thus z_1z_2 is analytic on $\Delta\setminus\Delta_2$ and so [13, Prop. 3.4] implies again that $(\Delta\setminus\Delta_2)\cap\Gamma_2 = \emptyset$ and therefore $\Gamma_2 \subset \Delta_2$. The reverse inclusion $\Delta_2 \subset \Gamma_2$ follows again since $z_{2,+}(x) = \tilde{z}_{2,+}(x) = \overline{\tilde{z}_{2,-}(x)} = \overline{z_{2,-}(x)}$ for $x \in \Delta_2$, yielding two different roots with the same modulus. This proves that $\Gamma_2 = \Delta_2$.

This reasoning can be extended to show that $\Gamma_k = \Delta_k$ for each $k = 3,\ldots,p$. In particular, we have that $\tilde{z}_k(x) = z_k(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{C}\setminus(\Delta_{k-1}\cup\Delta_k)$. This concludes the proof of Prop. 1.4. ☐

5 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Using (1.21) and a telescoping product we deduce that

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{P_{mp+k-j}(x)}{P_{mp+k}(x)} = \frac{1}{F_k(x)F_{k-1}(x)\cdots F_{k-j+1}(x)}, \qquad j=1,\ldots,p, \quad k=0,\ldots,p-1,$$

where each F_j is understood as $F_{j \bmod p}$. It follows that for $n = mp+k$, $0 \le k \le p-1$, the vector (3.3) is a Hermite-Padé approximant to the system of functions

$$\mathbf{G}^{(k)} = (G_1^{(k)}, G_2^{(k)}, \ldots, G_p^{(k)}),$$

where

$$G_j^{(k)}(x) = \frac{1}{F_k(x)} + c_{1,j-1}\frac{1}{F_k(x)F_{k-1}(x)} + \cdots + c_{j-1,j-1}\frac{1}{F_k(x)F_{k-1}(x)\cdots F_{k-j+1}(x)}. \tag{5.1}$$

In particular, we obtain the following orthogonality conditions

$$\int_\gamma P_n(x)\, x^l G_j^{(k)}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = 0, \qquad l=0,\ldots,n_j-1, \quad j=1,\ldots,p, \tag{5.2}$$

where γ is an arbitrary closed Jordan curve surrounding Δ_1. From (5.2) we see that the polynomials P_n satisfy certain multiple orthogonality relations, but with the weight functions $G_j^{(k)}(x)$ depending on the residue class k of n modulo p. To get around this issue, we will make a clever choice of the constants $c_{i,j-1}$ in (5.1).

Proposition 5.1. *Let j and k be fixed. The constants $c_{i,j-1}$ in* (5.1) *can be chosen so that*

$$G_j^{(k)}(x) = \frac{1}{F_{k-j+1}(x)}, \tag{5.3}$$

where again F_{k-j+1} is understood as $F_{(k-j+1) \bmod p}$.

Proof. The function $F_k(x)$ in (1.6) has a simple pole at $x=\infty$, with

$$K_k := \lim_{x\to\infty} F_k(x) - x = -b_{k-1,k-1}, \tag{5.4}$$

by virtue of (4.3) (with z replaced by x). As already mentioned, Liouville's theorem implies that $\psi^{(j)} - \psi^{(k)}$ is constant on $\mathcal{R}$, for any $j,k \in \{1,\ldots,p\}$. Combined with (5.4) and (4.2) this yields

$$F_j(x) - F_k(x) = \psi_0^{(j)}(x) - \psi_0^{(k)}(x) \equiv K_j - K_k, \quad x \in \overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \Delta_1. \tag{5.5}$$

Now let j and k be fixed. We will evaluate the sum (5.1) from right to left. Formally, we do this by defining functions $y_l(x)$, $l=0,\ldots,j$ with $y_0(x)=0$ and then recursively by

$$y_l(x) = y_{l-1}(x) + c_{j-l,j-1}\frac{1}{F_k(x)F_{k-1}(x)\cdots F_{k-j+l}(x)}, \tag{5.6}$$

for $l=1,\ldots,j$, with $c_{0,j-1} := 1$. So $y_l(x)$ is the sum of the last l terms in (5.1), and in particular $y_j(x) = G_j^{(k)}(x)$.

We will prove by induction on l that the constants $c_{j-l,j-1}$ can be chosen so that

$$y_l(x) = c_{j-l,j-1}\frac{1}{F_k(x)F_{k-1}(x)\cdots F_{k-j+l+1}(x)F_{k-j+1}(x)}, \tag{5.7}$$

for any $l = 1, \dots, j$. By taking $l = j$ this proves the proposition.

It remains to prove (5.7). For $l = 1$ this is trivial. Now assume by induction that (5.7) holds with l replaced by $l - 1 \in \{1, \dots, j-1\}$. From the definition (5.6) we then get

$$y_l(x) = c_{j-l+1,j-1} \frac{1}{F_k(x)F_{k-1}(x)\cdots F_{k-j+l}(x)F_{k-j+1}(x)} + c_{j-l,j-1} \frac{1}{F_k(x)F_{k-1}(x)\cdots F_{k-j+l}(x)}.$$

Putting on a common denominator yields

$$y_l(x) = \frac{c_{j-l+1,j-1} + c_{j-l,j-1}F_{k-j+1}(x)}{F_k(x)F_{k-1}(x)\cdots F_{k-j+l}(x)F_{k-j+1}(x)}.$$

Now by taking $c_{j-l+1,j-1} := c_{j-l,j-1}(K_{k-j+l} - K_{k-j+1})$ and using (5.5), this becomes

$$y_l(x) = c_{j-l,j-1} \frac{F_{k-j+l}(x)}{F_k(x)F_{k-1}(x)\cdots F_{k-j+l}(x)F_{k-j+1}(x)},$$

which shows that (5.7) holds for l. This proves the induction step. □

From (5.2) and (5.3), we see that the Chebyshev-Nikishin polynomials $P_n(x)$ satisfy the orthogonality conditions

$$\int_\gamma P_n(x)\, x^l \frac{1}{F_j(x)}\, \mathrm{d}x = 0, \qquad l = 0, \dots, n_j - 1, \quad j = 1, \dots, p, \tag{5.8}$$

with again γ an arbitrary closed Jordan curve surrounding Δ_1. Indeed, if $n = mp + k$ with $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$, then (5.8) can be checked for each fixed residue class k individually, using the above considerations and the fact that the orthogonality measures with the same number of orthogonality constraints can be freely interchanged.

By shrinking the contour γ in (5.8) to the interval Δ_1 and using the Stieltjes-Perron inversion formula, we get (see (1.14))

$$\int_{\Delta_1} P_n(x)\, x^l\, \mathrm{d}\nu_j(x) = 0, \qquad l = 0, \dots, n_j - 1, \quad j = 1, \dots, p. \tag{5.9}$$

This proves Theorem 1.2. □

6 Proof of Theorem 1.3

The proof uses some ideas from Aptekarev-Kaliaguine-Saff [3], see also [11].

Write $(\nu_1^{(1)}, \dots, \nu_p^{(1)}) := (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_p)$. These measures will form the first layer of the Nikishin hierarchy. Denote the Cauchy transform of $\nu_j^{(1)}$ by

$$F_j^{(1)}(x) := 1/F_j(x), \qquad j = 1, \dots, p,$$

recall (1.14). By the Stieltjes-Perron inversion principle, the density of $\nu_j^{(1)}$ is given by

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\nu_j^{(1)}(x)}{\mathrm{d}x} = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\left(F_{j,-}^{(1)}(x) - F_{j,+}^{(1)}(x)\right), \qquad x \in \Delta_1,$$

with again ± denoting the boundary values from the upper and lower half-plane respectively. With the help of (4.2) this becomes

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\nu_j^{(1)}(x)}{\mathrm{d}x} = \frac{-1}{2\pi i}\frac{\psi_{0,-}^{(j)}(x)-\psi_{0,+}^{(j)}(x)}{\psi_{0,+}^{(j)}(x)\psi_{0,-}^{(j)}(x)} = \frac{-1}{2\pi i}\frac{\psi_{0,-}^{(j)}(x)-\psi_{0,+}^{(j)}(x)}{\psi_0^{(j)}(x)\psi_1^{(j)}(x)} = \frac{-1}{2\pi i}\frac{\psi_{0,-}^{(1)}(x)-\psi_{0,+}^{(1)}(x)}{\psi_0^{(j)}(x)\psi_1^{(j)}(x)},$$

where the last equality uses that, according to (5.5),

$$\psi^{(j)}(x) = \psi^{(k)}(x) + K_j - K_k, \qquad 1 \le j,k \le p, \tag{6.1}$$

which implies

$$\psi_{0,\pm}^{(j)}(x) = \psi_{0,\pm}^{(1)}(x) + K_j - K_1.$$

(Notice that $\psi_0^{(j)}\psi_1^{(j)} \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{C}\setminus\Delta_2)$, i.e., it is holomorphic in $\mathbb{C}\setminus\Delta_2$.)

Let us prove that the ratio of densities of $\nu_j^{(1)}$ and $\nu_1^{(1)}$,

$$F_j^{(2)}(x) := \frac{F_{j,-}^{(1)}(x)-F_{j,+}^{(1)}(x)}{F_{1,-}^{(1)}(x)-F_{1,+}^{(1)}(x)}, \qquad x\in\Delta_1, \qquad j=2,\dots,p,$$

can be analytically extended to $\mathbb{C}\setminus\Delta_2$ and can be written as a Cauchy transform

$$F_j^{(2)}(x) = \int_{\Delta_2}\frac{1}{x-t}\,\mathrm{d}\nu_j^{(2)}(t), \qquad x\in\mathbb{C}\setminus\Delta_2, \qquad j=2,\dots,p,$$

for some measure $\nu_j^{(2)}$ with constant sign supported on Δ_2. The measures $(\nu_2^{(2)},\dots,\nu_p^{(2)})$ form the second layer of the Nikishin hierarchy.

In fact

$$F_j^{(2)}(x) = \frac{\psi_0^{(1)}(x)\psi_1^{(1)}(x)}{\psi_0^{(j)}(x)\psi_1^{(j)}(x)}, \qquad x\in\Delta_1, \qquad j=2,\dots,p,$$

and thus

$$F_j^{(2)} = \frac{\psi_0^{(1)}\psi_1^{(1)}}{\psi_0^{(j)}\psi_1^{(j)}} \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{C}\setminus\Delta_2), \qquad j=2,\dots,p. \tag{6.2}$$

Moreover, at infinity the numerator takes a finite value whereas the denominator has a simple pole, therefore

$$F_j^{(2)}(x) = O\left(\frac{1}{x}\right), \qquad x\to\infty,$$

having a simple zero at ∞ and no other zeros in $\mathbb{C}\setminus\Delta_2$.

Let γ be a positively oriented closed Jordan curve surrounding Δ_2. By Cauchy's integral formula we have that

$$F_j^{(2)}(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_\gamma \frac{F_j^{(2)}(t)}{x-t}\,\mathrm{d}t,$$

for all x exterior to γ. Shrinking γ to Δ_2 we get that

$$F_j^{(2)}(x) = \int_{\Delta_2}\frac{\mathrm{d}\nu_j^{(2)}(t)}{x-t},$$

where

$$\mathrm{d}\nu_j^{(2)}(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\left(F_{j,-}^{(2)}(t) - F_{j,+}^{(2)}(t)\right)\mathrm{d}t, \qquad t\in\Delta_2.$$

Since $\psi_0^{(k)} \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_1), k = 1, \ldots, p$, and $\Delta_1 \cap \Delta_2 = \emptyset$, the density of $\nu_j^{(2)}$ takes the form

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\nu_j^{(2)}(x)}{\mathrm{d}x} = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\left(F_{j,-}^{(2)}(x) - F_{j,+}^{(2)}(x)\right) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\frac{\psi_0^{(1)}(x)}{\psi_0^{(j)}(x)}\left(\frac{\psi_{1,-}^{(1)}(x)}{\psi_{1,-}^{(j)}(x)} - \frac{\psi_{1,+}^{(1)}(x)}{\psi_{1,+}^{(j)}(x)}\right), \quad x \in \Delta_2.$$

On the other hand, using (6.1), the expression in the last parentheses reduces to

$$\frac{\psi_{1,-}^{(1)}(x)\psi_{1,+}^{(j)}(x) - \psi_{1,+}^{(1)}(x)\psi_{1,-}^{(j)}(x)}{\psi_{1,-}^{(j)}(x)\psi_{1,+}^{(j)}(x)} = \frac{(K_j - K_1)(\psi_{1,-}^{(1)}(x) - \psi_{1,+}^{(1)}(x))}{\psi_1^{(j)}(x)\psi_2^{(j)}(x)}$$

since $\psi_{1,-}^{(j)}(x)\psi_{1,+}^{(j)}(x) = \psi_{2,+}^{(j)}(x)\psi_{1,+}^{(j)}(x) = \psi_{1,-}^{(j)}(x)\psi_{2,-}^{(j)}(x)$ can be extended analytically to a neighborhood of Δ_2. Consequently,

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\nu_j^{(2)}(x)}{\mathrm{d}x} = \frac{K_j - K_1}{2\pi i}\frac{\psi_0^{(1)}(x)(\psi_{1,-}^{(1)}(x) - \psi_{1,+}^{(1)}(x))}{\psi_0^{(j)}(x)\psi_1^{(j)}(x)\psi_2^{(j)}(x)}, \qquad x \in \Delta_2, \qquad j = 2, \ldots, p,$$

where $\psi_0^{(j)}\psi_1^{(j)}\psi_2^{(j)} \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_3)$ and $\psi_0^{(1)} \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_1)$. Moreover, from the symmetry of these functions we deduce that $\psi_0^{(1)}/\psi_0^{(j)}\psi_1^{(j)}\psi_2^{(j)}$ takes real values with a constant sign on Δ_2. On the other hand,

$$\psi_{1,-}^{(1)}(x) - \psi_{1,+}^{(1)}(x) = \psi_{1,-}^{(1)}(x) - \overline{\psi_{1,-}^{(1)}(x)} = 2i\,\mathrm{Im}\,\{\psi_{1,-}^{(1)}(x)\}, \qquad x \in \Delta_2.$$

Should $\psi_{1,-}^{(1)}(x) = 0$ for some x in the interior of Δ_2, we would have that at that point $\psi_{1,-}^{(1)}(x) = \psi_{1,+}^{(1)}(x)$. This is clearly impossible because $\psi^{(1)}$ is one to one on $\mathcal{R}$ whereas x_+ and x_- are distinct points on this Riemann surface. Consequently for each $j = 2, \ldots, p$, the measure $\nu_j^{(2)}$ has a constant sign on Δ_2.

In general, fix $l \in \{2, \ldots, p\}$ and assume that we have defined measures $(\nu_{l-1}^{(l-1)}, \ldots, \nu_p^{(l-1)})$ supported on Δ_{l-1}, forming the $(l-1)$ layer of the Nikishin hierarchy. Denote the Cauchy transform of $\nu_j^{(l-1)}$ by $F_j^{(l-1)}, j = l-1, \ldots, p$. Assume that we have also shown that

$$F_j^{(l-1)}(x) = \frac{m_{l-2,j}}{m_{l-2,l-2}}\frac{\psi_0^{(l-2)}(x)\ldots\psi_{l-2}^{(l-2)}(x)}{\psi_0^{(j)}(x)\ldots\psi_{l-2}^{(j)}(x)} \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_{l-1}), \qquad (\psi_0^{(0)} \equiv 1),$$

and

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\nu_j^{(l-1)}(x)}{\mathrm{d}x} = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\left(F_{j,-}^{(l-1)}(x) - F_{j,+}^{(l-1)}(x)\right) =$$
$$\frac{m_{l-1,j}}{2\pi i}\frac{\psi_0^{(l-2)}(x)\ldots\psi_{l-3}^{(l-2)}(x)}{\psi_0^{(j)}(x)\ldots\psi_{l-1}^{(j)}(x)}\left(\psi_{l-2,-}^{(1)}(x) - \psi_{l-2,+}^{(1)}(x)\right),$$

for certain constants $m_{l-2,j}, m_{l-1,j} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. (In fact, $m_{0,j} = 1$, $j = 0, \ldots, p$, $m_{1,j} = -1$, $j = 1, \ldots, p$, and $m_{2,j} = K_j - K_1, j = 2, \ldots, p$.)

Then, we set

$$F_j^{(l)}(x) := \frac{F_{j,-}^{(l-1)}(x) - F_{j,+}^{(l-1)}(x)}{F_{l-1,-}^{(l-1)}(x) - F_{l-1,+}^{(l-1)}(x)}, \qquad x \in \Delta_{l-1},$$

for $j = l, \ldots, p$. We will see that this function can be analytically extended to $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_l$, and that it is again a Cauchy transform

$$F_j^{(l)}(x) = \int_{\Delta_l} \frac{1}{x-t} \, \mathrm{d}\nu_j^{(l)}(t), \qquad x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_l, \tag{6.3}$$

for some constant sign measure $\nu_j^{(l)}$ supported on Δ_l. The measures $(\nu_l^{(l)}, \ldots, \nu_p^{(l)})$ form the lth layer of the Nikishin hierarchy. With this we will conclude the induction.

In fact, using the formulas from the induction hypothesis, it follows that

$$F_j^{(l)}(x) = \frac{m_{l-1,j}}{m_{l-1,l-1}} \frac{\psi_0^{(l-1)}(x) \ldots \psi_{l-1}^{(l-1)}(x)}{\psi_0^{(j)}(x) \ldots \psi_{l-1}^{(j)}(x)}, \qquad x \in \Delta_{l-1},$$

which by the properties of the branches $\psi_k^{(l-1)}$ and $\psi_k^{(j)}, k = 0, \ldots, l-1$, can be extended analytically to all $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_l$. At infinity the numerator takes a finite value whereas the denominator has a simple pole. Consequently,

$$F_j^{(l)}(x) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_l), \qquad F_j^{(l)}(x) = O\left(\frac{1}{x}\right), \qquad x \to \infty.$$

Therefore, using the Cauchy integral theorem, we obtain

$$F_j^{(l)}(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\gamma \frac{F_j^{(l)}(t)}{x-t} \, \mathrm{d}t$$

for all x exterior to γ, where γ is a positively oriented closed Jordan curve that surrounds Δ_l. Shrinking γ to Δ_l, we find that (6.3) takes place with

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\nu_j^{(l)}(x)}{\mathrm{d}x} = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\left(F_{j,-}^{(l)}(x) - F_{j,+}^{(l)}(x)\right) = \frac{m_{l,j}}{2\pi i} \frac{\psi_0^{(l-1)}(x) \ldots \psi_{l-2}^{(l-1)}(x)}{\psi_0^{(j)}(x) \ldots \psi_l^{(j)}(x)} \left(\psi_{l-1,-}^{(1)}(x) - \psi_{l-1,+}^{(1)}(x)\right), \tag{6.4}$$

for $x \in \Delta_l$, with $m_{l,j} = \frac{m_{l-1,j}(K_j - K_{l-1})}{m_{l-1,l-1}}$. Here, we also used (6.1). Using the expression for $\frac{\mathrm{d}\nu_j^{(l)}(x)}{\mathrm{d}x}$, arguing as we did above for the case $l = 2$ one deduces that $\nu_j^{(l)}$ has constant sign on Δ_l for each $j = l, \ldots, p$. The fact that the measures are absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure is a direct consequence of the expression we have found for them. This ends the proof of Theorem 1.3. ☐

Remark 6.1. Note that the generating measures ρ_j in Theorem 1.3 are nothing but the "diagonal" measures in the Nikishin hierarchy, i.e., $\rho_j = \nu_j^{(j)}$ given by (6.4).

Remark 6.2. The recursive relation given above between the constants $m_{l,j}$ allows us to write

$$m_{l,j} = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{l-1}(K_j - K_i)}{\prod_{i=1}^{l-2}(K_{l-1} - K_i)} = \frac{\prod_{i=0}^{l-2}(b_{i,i} - b_{j-1,j-1})}{\prod_{i=0}^{l-3}(b_{i,i} - b_{l-2,l-2})}, \tag{6.5}$$

for all $l = 2, \ldots, p$ and $j = l, \ldots, p$, where the second equality follows from (5.4).

7 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let

$$F_k(z) = z - b_{k-1,k-1} + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_l}{z^l}, \qquad |z| \geq R_0, \qquad k = 1, \ldots, p,$$

denote the Laurent expansion at infinity of F_k, where we are using (5.4)–(5.5). Set

$$F(z) = z + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_l}{z^l}, \qquad |z| \geq R_0.$$

Obviously,

$$F_k(z) = F(z) - b_{k-1,k-1}. \tag{7.1}$$

Since F is a translation of F_k, which is one branch of a conformal representation of the Riemann surface $\mathcal{R}$ onto $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$ (see (4.2)), F itself extends to a conformal representation of $\mathcal{R}$ onto $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$. We denote by $\mathcal{F}$ the analytic extension of F to all $\mathcal{R}$. For $j \neq k$ we have that $b_{j-1,j-1} \neq b_{k-1,k-1}$, otherwise $F_j = F_k$. Taking these facts into account, we conclude that there exist p distinct points $\zeta_0, \ldots, \zeta_{p-1} \in \mathcal{R}$ such that

$$\mathcal{F}(\zeta_k) = b_{k,k}, \qquad k = 0, \ldots, p-1.$$

In the sequel $\zeta_n = \zeta_k$ if $n \equiv k \mod p, k \in \{0, \ldots, p-1\}$.

It follows from (4.3) and (7.1) that

$$b_{k,k-1} = \lim_{z \to \infty} (z - F(z)) F_k(z) = -c_1 =: \beta, \qquad k = 0, \ldots, p-1,$$

so (1.11) is proved.

Using again (4.3) and (7.1), we find that

$$zF_k \cdots F_{k-p+1} = FF_k \cdots F_{k-p+1} + b_{k,k-1} F_{k-1} \cdots F_{k-p+1} + \cdots + b_{k,k-p}. \tag{7.2}$$

Writing equation (7.2) substituting k by $k+1$ and taking into consideration that $F_k \cdots F_{k-p+1} = F_{k+1} \cdots F_{k-p+2}$, we obtain the equality

$$b_{k,k-1} F_{k-1} \cdots F_{k-p+1} + \cdots + b_{k,k-p} = b_{k+1,k} F_k \cdots F_{k-p+2} + \cdots + b_{k+1,k-p+1},$$

which due to (7.1), and taking into consideration that F extends to all $\mathcal{R}$, takes the form

$$b_{k,k-1}(\mathcal{F} - b_{k-2,k-2}) \cdots (\mathcal{F} - b_{k-p,k-p}) + \cdots + b_{k,k-p+1}(\mathcal{F} - b_{k-p,k-p}) + b_{k,k-p} = \tag{7.3}$$

$$b_{k+1,k}(\mathcal{F} - b_{k-1,k-1}) \cdots (\mathcal{F} - b_{k-p+1,k-p+1}) + \cdots + b_{k+1,k-p+2}(\mathcal{F} - b_{k-p+1,k-p+1}) + b_{k+1,k-p+1}.$$

Evaluating (7.3) at $\zeta_{k-p+1} \in \mathcal{R}$, it follows that

$$b_{k,k-p+1}(b_{k-p+1,k-p+1} - b_{k-p,k-p}) + b_{k,k-p} = b_{k+1,k-p+1}, \tag{7.4}$$

which is equivalent to (1.12) when $l = p-1$.

Now, evaluating (7.3) at $\zeta_{k-p+2} \in \mathcal{R}$, we obtain

$$b_{k,k-p+2}(b_{k-p+2,k-p+2} - b_{k-p+1,k-p+1})(b_{k-p+2,k-p+2} - b_{k-p,k-p}) +$$

$$b_{k,k-p+1}(b_{k-p+2,k-p+2} - b_{k-p,k-p}) + b_{k,k-p} =$$

$$\begin{gathered}
b_{k,k-p+2}(b_{k-p+2,k-p+2} - b_{k-p+1,k-p+1})(b_{k-p+2,k-p+2} - b_{k-p,k-p}) + \\
b_{k,k-p+1}(b_{k-p+2,k-p+2} - b_{k-p+1,k-p+1}) + \\
b_{k,k-p+1}(b_{k-p+1,k-p+1} - b_{k-p,k-p}) + b_{k,k-p} = \\
b_{k+1,k-p+2}(b_{k-p+2,k-p+2} - b_{k-p+1,k-p+1}) + b_{k+1,k-p+1}.
\end{gathered}$$

Using (7.4), this equality reduces to

$$\begin{gathered}
b_{k,k-p+2}(b_{k-p+2,k-p+2} - b_{k-p+1,k-p+1})(b_{k-p+2,k-p+2} - b_{k-p,k-p}) + \\
b_{k,k-p+1}(b_{k-p+2,k-p+2} - b_{k-p+1,k-p+1}) = b_{k+1,k-p+2}(b_{k-p+2,k-p+2} - b_{k-p+1,k-p+1}).
\end{gathered}$$

We can cancel out $b_{k-p+2,k-p+2} - b_{k-p+1,k-p+1} (\neq 0)$ from both sides and we obtain

$$b_{k,k-p+2}(b_{k-p+2,k-p+2} - b_{k-p,k-p}) + b_{k,k-p+1} = b_{k+1,k-p+2} \tag{7.5}$$

which is (1.12) for $l = p - 2$.

In general, assume that (1.12) is valid for all $l \in \{p-1, p-2, \ldots, p-m\}$, with $m \leq p-2$. In order to prove that it is also valid for $\widetilde{l} := p - m - 1$, we evaluate (7.3) at $\zeta_{k-\widetilde{l}}$, and we get

$$\begin{gathered}
b_{k,k-\widetilde{l}}(b_{k-\widetilde{l},k-\widetilde{l}} - b_{k-\widetilde{l}-1,k-\widetilde{l}-1}) \ldots (b_{k-\widetilde{l},k-\widetilde{l}} - b_{k-p,k-p}) + \\
b_{k,k-\widetilde{l}}(b_{k-\widetilde{l},k-\widetilde{l}} - b_{k-\widetilde{l}-2,k-\widetilde{l}-2}) \ldots (b_{k-\widetilde{l},k-\widetilde{l}} - b_{k-p,k-p}) + \\
\ldots + b_{k,k-p+2}(b_{k-\widetilde{l},k-\widetilde{l}} - b_{k-p+1,k-p+1})(b_{k-\widetilde{l},k-\widetilde{l}} - b_{k-p,k-p}) + \\
b_{k,k-p+1}(b_{k-\widetilde{l},k-\widetilde{l}} - b_{k-p,k-p}) + b_{k,k-p} = \\
b_{k+1,k-\widetilde{l}}(b_{k-\widetilde{l},k-\widetilde{l}} - b_{k-\widetilde{l}-1,k-\widetilde{l}-1}) \ldots (b_{k-\widetilde{l},k-\widetilde{l}} - b_{k-p+1,k-p+1}) + \\
b_{k+1,k-\widetilde{l}-1}(b_{k-\widetilde{l},k-\widetilde{l}} - b_{k-\widetilde{l}-2,k-\widetilde{l}-2}) \ldots (b_{k-\widetilde{l},k-\widetilde{l}} - b_{k-p+1,k-p+1}) + \\
\ldots + b_{k+1,k-p+3}(b_{k-\widetilde{l},k-\widetilde{l}} - b_{k-p+2,k-p+2})(b_{k-\widetilde{l},k-\widetilde{l}} - b_{k-p+1,k-p+1}) + \\
b_{k+1,k-p+2}(b_{k-\widetilde{l},k-\widetilde{l}} - b_{k-p+1,k-p+1}) + b_{k+1,k-p+1}.
\end{gathered}$$

On the left-hand side we replace $b_{k,k-p+1}(b_{k-\widetilde{l},k-\widetilde{l}} - b_{k-p,k-p})$ by

$$b_{k,k-p+1}(b_{k-\widetilde{l},k-\widetilde{l}} - b_{k-p+1,k-p+1}) + b_{k,k-p+1}(b_{k-p+1,k-p+1} - b_{k-p,k-p}). \tag{7.6}$$

Now we apply (1.12) for $l = p-1$, and this allows us to delete the second term in (7.6) along with $b_{k,k-p}$ on the left-hand side and $b_{k+1,k-p+1}$ on the right-hand side. Now the factor $b_{k-\widetilde{l},k-\widetilde{l}} - b_{k-p+1,k-p+1}$ appears in all the terms on both sides of the resulting equation. We cancel out this factor everywhere to obtain a new equation in which on the left-hand side we have the expression

$$b_{k,k-p+2}(b_{k-\widetilde{l},k-\widetilde{l}} - b_{k-p,k-p}) + b_{k,k-p+1},$$

and on the right-hand side we have

$$b_{k+1,k-p+3}(b_{k-\widetilde{l},k-\widetilde{l}} - b_{k-p+2,k-p+2}) + b_{k+1,k-p+2}.$$

In a similar way, we now replace $b_{k,k-p+2}(b_{k-\widetilde{l},k-\widetilde{l}} - b_{k-p,k-p})$ by

$$b_{k,k-p+2}(b_{k-\widetilde{l},k-\widetilde{l}} - b_{k-p+2,k-p+2}) + b_{k,k-p+2}(b_{k-p+2,k-p+2} - b_{k-p,k-p}) \tag{7.7}$$

and apply (1.12) for $l = p-2$. This allows us to delete the second term in (7.7) along with $b_{k,k-p+1}$ on the left-hand side and $b_{k+1,k-p+2}$ on the right-hand side. The factor $b_{k-\widetilde{l},k-\widetilde{l}} - b_{k-p+2,k-p+2}$ appears in all the terms on both sides of the resulting equation. We cancel out this factor.

It is clear that continuing in this fashion we will arrive at the desired equation. Relation (1.11) may be regarded a special case of (1.12) for $l = 0$. We are done. □

Question 7.1. Suppose that a collection of real numbers $\{b_{k,j}\}$ is given satisfying (1.11)–(1.12). What other conditions must be added in order that the given collection of numbers corresponds to the periodic coefficients of the recurrence relation satisfied by a sequence of Chebyshev-Nikishin polynomials?

8 Formulas and strong asymptotics for the second kind functions

In this section we obtain strong asymptotics and an exact Widom-type formula for the second kind functions $\Psi_{n,l}$ in (1.25)–(1.26). The function $\Psi_{n,l}$ (with $1 \leq l \leq p$) satisfies the following boundary value problem:

Boundary value problem 8.1.

(*a*) *$\Psi_{n,l}$ is analytic for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \Delta_l$.*

(*b*) *$\Psi_{n,l}$ satisfies the jump relation ($\Psi_{n,0}(z) = P_n(z)$)*

$$(\Psi_{n,l}(x))_- - (\Psi_{n,l}(x))_+ = 2\pi i\, \Psi_{n,l-1}(x) \frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_l(x)}{\mathrm{d}x}, \qquad x \in \Delta_l. \tag{8.1}$$

$$\Psi_{n,l}(z) = O\Big(\frac{1}{z^{n_l+1}}\Big), \qquad z \to \infty,$$

with n_l in (1.2)*.*

(*d*) *$\Psi_{n,l}$ stays bounded near the endpoints α_l and β_l of the interval Δ_l, i.e., $\Psi_{n,l}(z) = O(1)$ as $z \to \alpha_l$ and $z \to \beta_l$.*

Properties (*a*) and (*b*) follow immediately from the definition of $\Psi_{n,l}$. Property (*c*) is a consequence of the orthogonality properties satisfied by $\Psi_{n,l-1}$ with respect to the measure $\mathrm{d}\rho_l$, proved in [15, Proposition 1]. Finally, (*d*) follows from the fact that $\Psi_{n,l-1}$ is analytic on Δ_l and

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_l(x)}{\mathrm{d}x} = \frac{\mathrm{d}\nu_l^{(l)}(x)}{\mathrm{d}x} = \begin{cases} O(|x-\alpha_l|^{1/2}), & x \to \alpha_l, \\ O(|x-\beta_l|^{1/2}), & x \to \beta_l, \end{cases}$$

see (6.4) and Remark 6.1. Given $\Psi_{n,l-1}$ (see (8.1)), it is readily seen that $\Psi_{n,l}(z)$ is uniquely determined by the above boundary value problem.

Proposition 8.2. *Fix $l \in \{0, \ldots, p\}$. For any m large enough and for any $k = 0, \ldots, p-1$, the following Widom-type formula holds:*

$$\Psi_{mp+k,l}(x) =$$
$$\frac{(-1)^{p+k}}{f_p} \sum_{j=l+1}^{p+1} \frac{\det F^{[p,k+1]}(z_j(x), x)}{\prod_{t=1, t\neq j}^{p+1}(z_j(x) - z_t(x))} \left(\prod_{i=0}^{l-1} m_{i+1,i+1} \frac{\psi_i^{(1)}(x) - \psi_{j-1}^{(1)}(x)}{\psi_i^{(l)}(x)\psi_{j-1}^{(i+1)}(x)} \right) z_j(x)^{-m-1}. \tag{8.2}$$

The constants $m_{i+1,i+1}$ are given in (6.4)*–*(6.5)*.*

Remark 8.3. Formula (8.2) can be computed for all $x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{A}$, where $\mathcal{A}$ consists of those points $x \in \mathbb{C}$ for which $z_i(x) = z_j(x)$ for certain $i \neq j$. Thus $\mathcal{A}$ is a finite set and it is formed by the zeros of the discriminant of $f(z, x) = 0$ in (1.17) with respect to the variable z. Note that the endpoints of the intervals Δ_l are points in $\mathcal{A}$.

The product of the entries $m_{i+1,i+1}$ in (8.2) can be evaluated using (6.5):

$$\prod_{i=0}^{l-1} m_{i+1,i+1} = -\prod_{i=1}^{l-1}(K_l - K_i) = -\prod_{i=0}^{l-2}(b_{i,i} - b_{l-1,l-1}).$$

(The minus sign comes from $m_{1,1} = -1$.) It also follows from (1.21), (1.24), and (4.2) that

$$\psi_{j-1}^{(k)}(x) = -\frac{\det F^{[p,k+1]}(z_j(x),x)}{\det F^{[p,k]}(z_j(x),x)}, \tag{8.3}$$

for all $k = 1, \ldots, p-1$ and $j = 1, \ldots, p+1$, and

$$\psi_{j-1}^{(p)}(x) = (-1)^{p-1} z_j^{-1}(x) \frac{\det F^{[p,1]}(z_j(x),x)}{\det F^{[p,p]}(z_j(x),x)}, \tag{8.4}$$

for all $j = 1, \ldots, p+1$, so in fact all the quantities in (8.2) depend on the minors of the block Toeplitz symbol $F(z,x)$ (1.16) evaluated at the roots $z = z_j(x)$.

We will prove formula (8.2) only for m large enough, although it may actually be valid for all m.

Proof of Proposition 8.2. We prove (8.2) using induction on l. The case $l = 0$ reduces to (1.22). Let us assume as induction hypothesis that (8.2) holds with l replaced by $l-1$. We need to check that the right hand side of (8.2) satisfies the four conditions (a)–(d) in the boundary value problem 8.1. Actually we will prove that the right hand side of (8.2), which we denote by $\widetilde{\Psi}_{mp+k,l}$, satisfies a weaker version of (a)–(d) where these conditions are replaced by

- (a') $\widetilde{\Psi}_{mp+k,l}(z)$ is analytic for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (\Delta_l \cup \mathcal{A})$.
- (b') $\widetilde{\Psi}_{mp+k,l}$ satisfies the jump relation

$$(\widetilde{\Psi}_{mp+k,l}(x))_- - (\widetilde{\Psi}_{mp+k,l}(x))_+ = 2\pi i\, \widetilde{\Psi}_{mp+k,l-1}(x) \frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_l(x)}{\mathrm{d}x}, \qquad x \in \Delta_l \setminus \mathcal{A}.$$

- (c') As $z \to \infty$,

$$\widetilde{\Psi}_{mp+k,l}(z) = O\Big(\frac{1}{z^{m+\delta}}\Big),$$

  where $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ is some fixed constant independent of m.
- (d') Near each point $a_i \in \mathcal{A}$ there is a fixed integer q_i such that $\widetilde{\Psi}_{mp+k,l}(z) = O((z-a_i)^{-q_i/2})$.

The integer q_i will be precisely the multiplicity of $x = a_i \in \mathcal{A}$ as a zero of the discriminant of $f(z,x) = 0$. The solution to the boundary value problem (a')–(d') is unique only for m large enough, since then the (possible) poles at the points in $\mathcal{A}$ cannot compete with the high-order zero at infinity. This will prove that $\Psi_{mp+k,l} \equiv \widetilde{\Psi}_{mp+k,l}$; that is, (8.2) holds.

In view of (8.3)–(8.4), the function $\widetilde{\Psi}_{mp+k,l}$ is a symmetric function of $z_{l+1}, \ldots, z_{p+1}$, and it is also a symmetric function of the variables $z_1, \ldots, z_l$. More specifically, if we view $\widetilde{\Psi}_{mp+k,l}$ as a function $\Lambda(z_1, \ldots, z_l, z_{l+1}, \ldots, z_{p+1}, x)$ in the variables z_k and x, then

$$\Lambda(z_1, \ldots, z_l, z_{l+1}, \ldots, z_{p+1}, x) = \Lambda(z_1^*, \ldots, z_l^*, z_{l+1}^*, \ldots, z_{p+1}^*, x),$$

where $(z_1^*, \ldots, z_l^*)$ is any permutation of $(z_1, \ldots, z_l)$, and $(z_{l+1}^*, \ldots, z_{p+1}^*)$ is any permutation of $(z_{l+1}, \ldots, z_{p+1})$. This property readily implies the analyticity of $\widetilde{\Psi}_{mp+k,l}$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus (\Delta_l \cup \mathcal{A})$, which is Part (a').

For Part (b') we distinguish in the expression of $\widetilde{\Psi}_{mp+k,l}(x)$ the term with $j = l+1$ from the terms with $j = l+2,\ldots,p+1$. We start with the latter terms. First we write the factor with $i = l-1$ in the product in (8.2) as

$$\frac{\psi^{(1)}_{l-1}(x)-\psi^{(1)}_{j-1}(x)}{\psi^{(l)}_{l-1}(x)\psi^{(l)}_{j-1}(x)} = \frac{\psi^{(l)}_{l-1}(x)-\psi^{(l)}_{j-1}(x)}{\psi^{(l)}_{l-1}(x)\psi^{(l)}_{j-1}(x)} = \frac{1}{\psi^{(l)}_{j-1}(x)} - \frac{1}{\psi^{(l)}_{l-1}(x)}. \tag{8.5}$$

Observe now that the $+$ and $-$ boundary values on $\Delta_l \setminus \mathcal{A}$ of the expression

$$\frac{(-1)^{p+k}}{f_p}\sum_{j=l+2}^{p+1}\frac{\det F^{[p,k+1]}(z_j(x),x)}{\prod_{t=1,t\neq j}^{p+1}(z_j(x)-z_t(x))}\left(\prod_{i=0}^{l-2} m_{i+1,i+1}\frac{\psi_i^{(1)}(x)-\psi_{j-1}^{(1)}(x)}{\psi_i^{(l)}(x)\psi_{j-1}^{(i+1)}(x)}\right)\frac{z_j(x)^{-m-1}}{\psi^{(l)}_{j-1}(x)} \tag{8.6}$$

are equal. Indeed, this follows since, with the identifications (8.3)–(8.4), equation (8.6) depends symmetrically on the variables $z_{l+2},\ldots,z_{p+1}$, depends symmetrically also on $z_1,\ldots,z_{l-1}$, and does not depend on z_l or z_{l+1}.

The equality of the $+$ and $-$ boundary values of (8.6) also holds if we drop the factor $1/\psi^{(l)}_{j-1}(x)$. In view of (8.5), it then follows that if we subtract the $+$ boundary value from the $-$ boundary value of the terms in $\widetilde{\Psi}_{mp+k,l}(x)$ with $j = l+2,\ldots,p+1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&m_{l,l}\frac{\psi^{(l)}_{l-1,-}(x)-\psi^{(l)}_{l-1,+}(x)}{\psi^{(l)}_{l-1}(x)\psi^{(l)}_{l}(x)}\\
&\times\frac{(-1)^{p+k}}{f_p}\sum_{j=l+2}^{p+1}\frac{\det F^{[p,k+1]}(z_j(x),x)}{\prod_{t=1,t\neq j}^{p+1}(z_j(x)-z_t(x))}\left(\prod_{i=0}^{l-2} m_{i+1,i+1}\frac{\psi_i^{(1)}(x)-\psi_{j-1}^{(1)}(x)}{\psi_i^{(l)}(x)\psi_{j-1}^{(i+1)}(x)}\right)z_j(x)^{-m-1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{8.7}$$

Here we also used that the product $\psi^{(l)}_{l-1,-}(x)\psi^{(l)}_{l-1,+}(x) = \psi^{(l)}_{l-1}(x)\psi^{(l)}_{l}(x)$ is analytic across Δ_l.

Using the relations $z_{l+1,\pm}(x) = z_{l,\mp}(x)$, $\psi^{(s)}_{l,\pm}(x) = \psi^{(s)}_{l-1,\mp}(x)$, $x \in \Delta_l$, and other simple considerations, it is easy to see that the difference of the $-$ and $+$ boundary values of the term in $\widetilde{\Psi}_{mp+k,l}(x)$ corresponding to $j = l+1$ is given by the expression in (8.7) with the sum $\sum_{j=l+2}^{p+1}$ replaced by $\sum_{j=l}^{l+1}$. In conclusion,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\widetilde{\Psi}_{mp+k,l}(x))_- - (\widetilde{\Psi}_{mp+k,l}(x))_+ &= m_{l,l}\frac{\psi^{(l)}_{l-1,-}(x)-\psi^{(l)}_{l-1,+}(x)}{\psi^{(l)}_{l-1}(x)\psi^{(l)}_{l}(x)}\\
\times\frac{(-1)^{p+k}}{f_p}\sum_{j=l}^{p+1}\frac{\det F^{[p,k+1]}(z_j(x),x)}{\prod_{t=1,t\neq j}^{p+1}(z_j(x)-z_t(x))}&\left(\prod_{i=0}^{l-2} m_{i+1,i+1}\frac{\psi_i^{(1)}(x)-\psi_{j-1}^{(1)}(x)}{\psi_i^{(l)}(x)\psi_{j-1}^{(i+1)}(x)}\right)z_j(x)^{-m-1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{8.8}$$

By the induction hypothesis, we know that $\Psi_{mp+k,l-1}(x)$ is given by the expression in the last line of (8.8) with $\psi_i^{(l)}(x)$ replaced by $\psi_i^{(l-1)}(x)$. This observation and (6.4) gives Part (b').

Finally, the conditions (c') (cf. (4.1)) and (d') are obvious. This proves (8.2). □

Remark 8.4. The functions defined by

$$\Phi_{n,l}(z) := \int_{\Delta_1}\frac{P_n(t)}{z-t}\,\mathrm{d}\nu_l(t), \qquad l = 1,\ldots,p,$$

where the measures ν_l are the orthogonality measures in Theorem 1.2, are also often called second kind functions (see [15, pg. 672]), and represent the linear remainders in the Hermite-Padé approximation to the functions $\int_{\Delta_1} \frac{d\nu_l(t)}{z-t}$, $l = 1, \ldots, p$. It is easy to see that for all m large enough, we have the formula

$$\Phi_{mp+k,l}(x) = \frac{(-1)^{p+k}}{f_p} \sum_{j=2}^{p+1} \frac{\det F^{[p,k+1]}(z_j(x), x)}{\prod_{t=1,t\neq j}^{p+1}(z_j(x) - z_t(x))} \left(\frac{1}{\psi_0^{(l)}(x)} - \frac{1}{\psi_{j-1}^{(l)}(x)} \right) z_j(x)^{-m-1}. \tag{8.9}$$

We leave the justification of (8.9) to the reader.

Corollary 8.5. *The following strong asymptotic formulas hold uniformly on compact subsets of the indicated regions. For each fixed* $k \in \{0, \ldots, p-1\}$ *and* $l \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \Psi_{mp+k,l}(x)\, z_{l+1}(x)^{m+1}$$
$$= \frac{(-1)^{p+k}}{f_p} \frac{\det F^{[p,k+1]}(z_{l+1}(x), x)}{\prod_{t=1,t\neq l+1}^{p+1}(z_{l+1}(x) - z_t(x))} \left(\prod_{i=0}^{l-1} m_{i+1,i+1} \frac{\psi_i^{(1)}(x) - \psi_l^{(1)}(x)}{\psi_i^{(l)}(x)\, \psi_l^{(i+1)}(x)} \right), \quad x \in \mathbb{C}\setminus(\Delta_l \cup \Delta_{l+1}),$$

and

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \Phi_{mp+k,l}(x)\, z_2(x)^{m+1}$$
$$= \frac{(-1)^{p+k}}{f_p} \frac{\det F^{[p,k+1]}(z_2(x), x)}{\prod_{t=1,t\neq 2}^{p+1}(z_2(x) - z_t(x))} \left(\frac{1}{\psi_0^{(l)}(x)} - \frac{1}{\psi_1^{(l)}(x)} \right), \qquad x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (\Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2).$$

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of (8.2), (8.9), and the fact that $|z_{l+1}(x)| < |z_j(x)|$ for all $j \geq l+2$ and $x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (\Delta_l \cup \Delta_{l+1})$ (cf. (1.18) and (1.19)). ☐

9 Alternative systems of multi-indices

The results in this paper were formulated for the standard "staircase" system of multi-indices $\mathbf{n}$ in (1.2). More generally, let $\Pi := (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_p)$ be an arbitrary permutation of $(1, \ldots, p)$. For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, define

$$\mathbf{n}^\Pi := (n_1^\Pi, \ldots, n_p^\Pi) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^p$$

as the unique multi-index such that

$$n_{\pi_1}^\Pi \geq \ldots \geq n_{\pi_p}^\Pi \geq n_{\pi_1}^\Pi - 1, \qquad \text{and} \quad |\mathbf{n}^\Pi| := n_1^\Pi + \ldots + n_p^\Pi = n. \tag{9.1}$$

For the trivial permutation $\Pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_p) = (1, \ldots, p)$, this definition reduces to (1.2).

Let $Q_n^\Pi(z)$ be the monic multiple orthogonal polynomial of degree n satisfying (1.3), with n_k replaced by n_k^Π. The polynomials $Q_n^\Pi(z)$ satisfy a recurrence relation of the form (1.4), with recurrence coefficients $a_{n,m}^\Pi$ having periodic limits $b_{i,j}^\Pi$ as in (1.7). We define the block Toeplitz matrix T^Π and the Chebyshev-Nikishin polynomials $P_n^\Pi(z)$ as in (1.8)–(1.10) and (1.13) respectively, with $b_{i,j}^\Pi$ instead of $b_{i,j}$.

We have the following generalization to Theorem 1.1: The numbers $b_{i,j}^\Pi$ satisfy the relations (1.11)–(1.12), with β independent of the permutation Π.

We also have the following generalization to Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 9.1. *The Chebyshev-Nikishin polynomials* P_n^Π *satisfy the orthogonality conditions*

$$\int_{\Delta_1} P_n^\Pi(x)\, x^l \,\mathrm{d}\nu_k(x) = 0, \qquad l = 0,\dots,n_k^\Pi - 1, \quad k = 1,\dots,p, \tag{9.2}$$

with ν_k *the measure defined by* (1.14) *(independently of the permutation* Π*), and with* n_k^Π *the* k*-th component of* $\mathbf{n}^\Pi$ *in* (9.1)*.*

Theorem 9.1 can be proved in a similar way as Theorem 1.2 and we leave the details to the interested reader. See also the next paragraphs for more information.

We define $F_k^\Pi(z)$ as in (1.6), with each Q_n replaced by Q_n^Π. The main result in [5] implies that $F_k^\Pi(z) = F_{\pi_k}(z)$.

Define the quantities $F^\Pi(z,x)$, $f^\Pi(z,x)$, $z_k^\Pi(x)$ and Γ_k^Π as in (1.16)–(1.19), with $b_{i,j}^\Pi$ instead of $b_{i,j}$. Reproducing the proof in Section 4, we are led to the following analogue of (4.11):

$$z_1^\Pi(x) = \frac{1}{F_1^\Pi(x)\dots F_p^\Pi(x)} = \frac{1}{F_1(x)\dots F_p(x)} = z_1(x),$$

for all x sufficiently large, where we used the above observation that $F_k^\Pi(z) = F_{\pi_k}(z)$. So for all x sufficiently large, $z_1^\Pi(x) = z_1(x)$ is independent of the permutation Π. Analytic continuation then implies that each of the roots $z_k^\Pi(x) = z_k(x)$ is independent of Π. This implies in turn that the algebraic equation $f^\Pi(z,x) = f(z,x) = 0$ is independent of Π and therefore also $\Gamma_k^\Pi = \Gamma_k = \Delta_k$.

Question 9.2. Given the intervals $\Delta_1,\dots,\Delta_p$, we have now obtained $p!$ block Toeplitz matrices T^Π, labeled by the permutations Π of $(1,\dots,p)$, which all have the same algebraic equation $f(z,x) = 0$, and which all satisfy (1.20). Are there any other block Toeplitz matrices T of the form (1.8)–(1.10) (with arbitrary entries $b_{i,j}$) leading to this same algebraic equation $f(z,x) = 0$? (or equivalently, for which $\Gamma_k = \Delta_k$ for all k, using the notations in (1.16)–(1.19)?)

We conjecture that the answer to the above question is negative.

References

[1] A.I. Aptekarev, Strong asymptotics of multiply orthogonal polynomials for Nikishin systems, Mat. Sb. **190** (1999), 3–44; English transl. in Sb. Math. **190** (1999), 631–669.

[2] A.I. Aptekarev, V.A. Kaliaguine, G. López Lagomasino, and I.A. Rocha, On the limit behavior of the recurrence coefficients for multiple orthogonal polynomials. J. Approx. Theory **139** (2006), 346–370.

[3] A.I. Aptekarev, V.A. Kaliaguine, and E.B. Saff, Higher order three-term recurrences and asymptotics of multiple orthogonal polynomials, Constr. Approx. **30** (2009), 175–223.

[4] A.I. Aptekarev and A.B.J. Kuijlaars, Hermite-Padé approximations and multiple orthogonal polynomial ensembles, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **66** (2011), 123–190; English transl. in Russian Math. Surveys, **66** (2011), 1133–1199.

[5] A.I. Aptekarev, G. López Lagomasino, and I.A. Rocha, Ratio asymptotic of Hermite-Padé orthogonal polynomials for Nikishin systems, Mat. Sb. **196** (2005), 3–20; English transl. in Sb. Math. **196** (2005), 1089–1107.

[6] A.I. Aptekarev and V.G. Lysov, Systems of Markov functions generated by graphs and the asymptotics of their Hermite-Padé approximants, Mat. Sb. **201** (2010), 29–78; English transl. in Sb. Math. **201** (2010), 183–234.

[7] M. Bender, S. Delvaux, and A.B.J. Kuijlaars, Multiple Meixner-Pollaczek polynomials and the six-vertex model, J. Approx. Theory **163** (2011), 1606–1637.

[8] J. Bustamante and G. López Lagomasino, Hermite-Padé approximation for Nikishin systems of analytic functions, Mat. Sb. **183** (1992), 117–138; English transl. in Russian Acad. Sci. Sb. Math. **77** (1994), 367–384.

[9] E. Coussement and W. Van Assche, Multiple orthogonal polynomials associated with the modified Bessel functions of the first kind, Constr. Approx. **19** (2003), 237–263.

[10] S. Delvaux, Equilibrium problem for the eigenvalues of banded block Toeplitz matrices, arXiv:1101.2644, to appear in Math. Nachr.

[11] S. Delvaux and A. López, High order three-term recursions, Riemann-Hilbert minors and Nikishin systems on star-like sets, arXiv:1202.4000.

[12] K. Driver and H. Stahl, Normality in Nikishin systems, Indag. Math. **5** (1994), 161–187.

[13] M. Duits and A.B.J. Kuijlaars, An equilibrium problem for the limiting eigenvalue distribution of banded Toeplitz matrices, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. **30** (2008), 173–196.

[14] U. Fidalgo and G. López Lagomasino, Nikishin systems are perfect, Constr. Approx. **34** (2011), 297-356.

[15] A.A. Gonchar, E.A. Rakhmanov, and V.N. Sorokin, On Hermite-Padé approximants for systems of functions of Markov type, Mat. Sb. **188** (1997), 33–58; English transl. in Sb. Math. **188** (1997), 671-696.

[16] V.A. Kaliaguine, Hermite-Padé approximants and spectral analysis of nonsymmetric operators, Mat. Sb. **185** (1994), 79–100; English transl. in Russian Acad. Sci. Sb. Math. **82** (1995), 199–216.

[17] V.A. Kaliaguine, The operator moment problem, vector continued fractions, and an explicit form of the Favard theorem for vector orthogonal polynomials, Proceedings of the International Conference on Orthogonality, Moment Problems and Continued Fractions (Delft, 1994), J. Comput. Appl. Math., **65** (1995), 181–193.

[18] M.G. Krein and A.A. Nudelman, “The Markov Moment Problem and Extremal Problems”, Transl. of Math. Monographs Vol. 50, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1977.

[19] A.B.J. Kuijlaars, Multiple orthogonal polynomial ensembles, Contemp. Math. Vol. 507, 2010, 155–176.

[20] A.B.J. Kuijlaars, A. Martínez-Finkelshtein, and F. Wielonsky, Non-intersecting squared Bessel paths and multiple orthogonal polynomials for modified Bessel weights, Comm. Math. Phys. **286** (2009), 217–275.

[21] A. López García, Asymptotics of multiple orthogonal polynomials for a system of two measures supported on a starlike set, J. Approx. Theory **163** (2011), 1146–1184.

[22] G. López Lagomasino and I.A. Rocha, A canonical family of multiple orthogonal polynomials for Nikishin systems, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **372** (2010), 390–401.

[23] A. Maté and P. Nevai, A generalization of Poincaré’s theorem for recurrence equations, J. Approx. Theory **63** (1990), 92–97.

[24] E.M. Nikishin, On simultaneous Padé approximations, Mat. Sb. **113** (1980), 499–519; English transl. in Math. USSR Sb. **41** (1982), 409–426.

[25] E.M. Nikishin and V.N. Sorokin, “Rational Approximations and Orthogonality”, Nauka, Moscow 1988; English transl. in Transl. of Math. Monographs Vol. 92, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1991.

[26] J. Van Iseghem, Vector orthogonal relations. Vector QD-algorithm, J. Comput. Appl. Math. **19** (1987), 141–150.

[27] H. Widom, Asymptotic behavior of block Toeplitz matrices and determinants, Adv. in Math. **13** (1974), 284–322.